

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—June 16, 1986

The House met at 12 noon.

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR of Michigan) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker.

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 12, 1986.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAVID E. BONIOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, June 16, 1986.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are thankful, O God, for those who give of their time and talents helping other people along life's way. We specially remember the volunteers who, with no thought of reward, give of their energy to assist and encourage those whose lives have been touched by problems. Encourage each of us, O God, not only to do what is expected of us, but to walk the extra mile of service and good will. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 15, 1986, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4420) "An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the retirement system for new members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. QUAYLE, Mr. EAST, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DENTON, Mr. GRAMM, Mr.

NUNN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HART, Mr. EXON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. GLENN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2069. An act to amend the Job Training Partnership Act;

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to commemorate the bicentennial anniversary of the first patent and the first copyright laws;

S.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 9, 1986, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week";

S.J. Res. 357. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 15, 1986, through September 21, 1986, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week"; and

S.J. Res. 361. Joint resolution opposing the participation of the Chilean vessel Esmeralda in the July 4th Liberty Weekend celebration.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

## RURAL WATER RIGHT-OF-WAY POLICY ACT OF 1985

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3617) to exempt rural water systems facilities assisted under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act as amended from certain right-of-way rental payments under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections are heard. The bill is stricken from the Consent Calendar.

This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

## TERRORISM, ARSON, AND BOMBINGS OF WOMEN'S HEALTH CLINICS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee that I chair of the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the FBI and over terrorism in the United States. I am pleased to say that the FBI has a handle on terrorism in the United States. A few years ago there were a hundred incidents a year. Last year in 1985 the incidents had been reduced to seven and I believe it is much less than that this year; however, Mr. Speaker, we have another kind of epidemic, which is not called terrorism, but which really is going on in this country and that is the arson and bombing of women's health clinics. It is approaching an epidemic situation with up to 40 in the last few months, the latest 2, 1 in Wichita and 1 in St. Louis just last week.

Now, the jurisdiction there over arson and bombing is Federal. It is with the Alcohol, Tax, and Firearm Agency of the Department of the Treasury. They are doing a good job. More than half the cases have been solved and the people convicted and many of them are in jail today; but the epidemic goes on.

We are studying, a number of us are studying, whether new laws are needed perhaps to designate arson and the bombing of women's health clinics as terrorism, which would then bring the FBI into the matter.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I think it is sad that our political leaders and high elected officials here in Washington, DC, do not speak out on this issue and condemn this epidemic of bombing and arson of women's clinics.

## THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE PROTECTING WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE CLINICS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend in my district, we saw an example of the Justice Department really not aiding women in any way, fashion, or form. I have said that allowing Attorney General Meese to be in charge of women's rights is like asking Evil Knievel to take care of your car.

What we saw in Denver this weekend were massive attempts to try to close down family planning clinics. I was inside one of those clinics as we watched the door being smashed.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Thank goodness, the Denver police got it under control, but it was nothing but a family planning clinic and they were trying to close it down and keep people from coming in.

The incredible violence that was displayed by this group was just amazing.

Clearly, what they are doing is not the Roe versus Wade decision, but the Griswold versus Connecticut decision dealing with the right of people to have access to family planning.

The head of the Right to Life group meeting in Denver this weekend said that they did not agree with the violence that was exhibited by different groups in Denver. I certainly hope he will join with me and others in asking Attorney General Meese then to please enforce the law about criminal conspiracy over State lines. That is clearly what is going on as we saw the 39th clinic being bombed and we saw many others with terrific violent acts, such as the one in Denver, forcing the local police to do what the Federal Government should be doing.

#### ELIMINATE CLASS 1 DIFFERENTIAL PROVISION IN FARM BILL

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in debate on the farm bill last year, a number of us tried to warn the House that the class 1 differential provision in the bill at that time made absolutely no economic sense and was in fact regional inequitable.

Saturday, members of the Farmers' Union in my district, when I met with them in Junction City, gave me copies of 10,000 petitions which farmers from the seven-State area had signed, indicating their opposition to this differential provision and indicating their desire that the new farm bill be changed to eliminate that differential.

Later in the week, I will see to it that these petitions are delivered to the Department of Agriculture and to the White House, but I simply want to take this time right now to make clear once again on the floor that farmers recognize that it makes no sense whatsoever to be telling farmers in most areas of the country that they ought to be reducing production through devices such as the whole herd buyout, while at the same time the differential in fact provides an incentive for increased dairy production at a time when we are already in surplus.

I hope that sooner or later the Federal Government recognizes that we have to change not just this differential provision, but a good many other provisions in that agriculture bill as well.

#### THE BEAT GOES ON

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, about 20 years ago, there was a song on the radio that had words to the effect that "the beat goes on."

Well, Mr. Speaker, on the southern borders of the United States, the beat does go on. We continue to have day after day after day apprehensions in record numbers of people slipping across the border illegally, and yet we have done nothing to this point in this Congress or the previous Congress, or the Congress before that, or the Congress before that, to respond to that problem.

Two weeks ago, we set a new record. We apprehended, unfortunately, our 1 millionth illegal alien in the United States in this calendar year. If that continues, we will apprehend between 1.8 and 2 million illegal aliens in the United States in a single year, enough to make up four new congressional districts, and that is just the number who have been caught.

There are all sorts of reasons why people are coming. We can sympathize, we can empathize with many of them, but the United States is a sovereign nation. It has a right to determine its own borders and to assure that it does have sovereignty and it exercises that sovereignty.

The missing link in all this is action by the Congress. We hope tomorrow in the Judiciary Committee to be marking up a new bill, an immigration reform package. It is my hope that we will continue marking it up this week until completed and then expeditiously have it on the floor so that we might join the other body in answering the cries of many Americans across the land, "When is Congress going to act?"

#### SOUTH AFRICA ON VERGE OF EXPLODING

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, South Africa is on the verge of exploding. The Botha government has decided to crack down on the black majority with every conceivable repressive measure, including violence.

As for the international outrage, South Africa has defiantly told the world and the United States to take a hike, that they will preserve their racist structure at any cost, even if it means killing people.

Mr. Speaker, our policy of constructive engagement has become a constructive disaster. Expressing outrage and expelling South African diplomats

and closing down consulates will not be enough. If South Africa believes that the world's greatest superpower only winks at their excesses, they will continue their hard line policy.

What can the United States do? First, we can impose economic sanctions and disinvest. We can stop protecting South Africa every time the United Nations tries to do something. We can take their moderate black leaders seriously, like Bishop Tutu and the Reverend Boesak. We can mobilize the international community and world opinion against this racist structure.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready to impose sanctions when it comes to standing up for democracy in leftwing Nicaragua, but strangely silent when it comes to standing up for democracy in rightist South Africa.

#### OUR "ALICE IN WONDERLAND" POLICY WITH SAUDI ARABIA

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in "Alice in Wonderland," the Red Queen instructed Alice at one point, "A word means what I want it to mean, neither more nor less."

Well, if President Reagan can certify this week to the Congress that Saudi Arabia has played a constructive role in the peace process, then I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we now have Alice in Wonderland topsy-turvy logic governing us.

I fully submit that we have destroyed the usefulness of the certification to Congress as a means of extending congressional oversight to make sure that the actual implementation of policies follows the congressional will.

The Saudis have opposed the peace process and obstructed it in every way that they could. They penalized Egypt for making peace with Israel. They voted to expel Egypt from the Arab League. They voted to assay economic sanctions against Egypt. They voted to oppose Egypt's readmission to the Arab League and they threatened the same thing in 1983 against King Hussein of Jordan when he began to indicate interest in negotiating with the Israelis on the terms of President Reagan's own peace initiative in the Middle East.

It would be a travesty if the President, in the face of the clear record of obstructionism by Saudi Arabia, including financing terrorism and the PLO to the extent of \$500 million a year or more for many years, can honestly and with a straight face certify to this Congress that the Saudis have had a constructive influence on the road to peace in the Middle East.



□ 1215

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE  
SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Tuesday, June 17, 1986.

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT  
RIGHTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2798) to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of the status of certain individuals as a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces or as a member of the National Guard.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2798

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2021(b)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—*

(1) by inserting "or seeks" after "who holds"; and

(2) by inserting "hiring," after "shall not be denied".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before yielding time, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota, for bringing this bill to the floor. This is a measure I introduced some time ago, and I am grateful for his action to get the bill before the House. Having been with TOM DASCHLE when we did visit Reserve and National Guard members in his great State of South Dakota, I know he shares my views on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his insight and his dedication in bringing this bill to the floor this afternoon. Without his help and his

cooperation, certainly our success in this effort would not have been possible.

Mr. Speaker, since 1940, Congress has protected the citizen soldier who leaves employment to perform military duty by safeguarding the former service member's return to preservice employment. Additionally, title 38, United States Code, provides that National Guard and Reserve members shall not be denied retention in employment because of Guard and Reserve obligations. Title 38 also extends to a reservist or National Guard member the right to take unpaid leave of absence from his or her civilian job to participate in military drills or active duty for training. Current law, however, provides no protection for members of the Guard and Reserve against discrimination in initial employment because a jobseeker is a member of a Reserve component.

Witnesses who testified before the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment, which I have the honor to chair, told us that there have been instances of employers refusing to hire reservists and Guard members because of their military status. According to the Labor Department's Office of Veterans' Employment and Training, the number of Guard and Reserve personnel falling victim to hiring discrimination is rising dramatically. In 1977, 31 percent of employment discrimination cases handled by DOL were for Guard and Reserve members. The number has jumped to 56 percent of the 1986 cases handled this year.

As a part of the country's total force, the Reserve components are assuming increased roles and missions. For example, by fiscal year 1989, the combined Reserve component strength is planned to be 51 percent of the total Army, 20 percent of the total Navy, 24 percent of the total Air Force, and 22 percent of the total Marine Corps.

Increased dependence on the Guard and Reserve may well result in longer and more frequent training. In order to avoid the generally minor disruptions which can be caused by an employee's status as a reservist, some employers will undoubtedly discriminate against job applicants who serve in a Reserve component. The result of this sort of action is a decreased willingness of individuals to join and serve in the Guard or Reserve.

The Department of Defense, which is sensitive to the importance of employer cooperation and support, established the National Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve. This committee's role is to familiarize employers with the importance of the Guard and Reserve, thus encouraging personnel policies and practices that are tolerant of employee participation in Reserve programs.

In spite of these effective efforts to establish strong ties with the employer community, it is our feeling that statutory protection against discrimination in hiring must be enacted. Further growth of the Reserve and National Guard is planned and recruitment will be even more difficult because of the declining young population. These circumstances make the enactment of H.R. 2798 critical to the effort being made by our Reserve Forces to reduce losses due to employment conflicts.

I also want to encourage the Federal Government to extend maximum support to its employees who serve in the Reserve components. Such Federal support, including the support of Members of Congress for their Guard and Reserve employees, is important and will demonstrate the Federal commitment for the Reserve components to civilian employers. We surely cannot ask any more of employers outside the Government than we ask of ourselves.

Again, I want to compliment the chairman of the full committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY, for introducing this legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor and am grateful to all members of the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment for their cooperation and assistance as we moved this bill through committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is important legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues in this House to join me in its support.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2798, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment of members of the National Guard and military Reserves.

This is an excellent step to encourage and facilitate participation in the Nation's defense by citizen soldiers. More than 45 years ago Congress recognized in the law that citizens leaving the military should have the right to return to their former civilian jobs after taking up arms to defend our country. National Guard and Reserve members also have been given the legal right to retention in their employment while participating in military training.

Yet, somehow the right to employment itself was never protected. An employer can ask an applicant for employment whether he or she is a member of the National Guard or Reserves and refuse to hire the applicant if the answer is yes. The applicant has no legal recourse under Federal law, and few State laws provide any protection. It seems obvious, when the law prohibits so many other kinds of discrimination, that men and women who

serve their country should have such protection.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment conducted hearings on H.R. 2798 and found support for it was unanimous. The Veterans' Administration, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Defense strongly favor this bill. It has the backing of National Guard and Reserve members, and veterans.

Is there really a problem with this kind of employment discrimination? Unfortunately, the evidence presented to the subcommittee shows that there is. It may be difficult to document the extent of the discrimination, but it is occurring, according to wholly credible testimony contained in the record of the hearing on April 23, 1986. We should act to put a stop to it.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the measure would cost the Government nothing. The enforcement mechanism already exists in the Department of Labor and the Department has adequate resources.

H.R. 2798 was introduced and nurtured by our very able chairman, Mr. MONTGOMERY, who is a leading protector of veterans and members of our armed services. It was reported out of subcommittee, thanks to the efforts of Mr. DASCHLE, chairman of the subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment, and of Mr. McEWEN, the subcommittee's ranking member.

With the decision by DOD to rely increasingly on the National Guard and Reserves to provide a significant portion of the manpower for our military forces, rather than have very large standing forces, it becomes doubly important to ensure that nothing like this employment discrimination is going to interfere with the ability of our military services to recruit sufficient members of qualified men and women.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation just makes plain good sense, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

It is only fair, Mr. Speaker, that those citizens who stand ready to defend our Nation should not be discriminated against in the job market.

I certainly want to thank the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] again, and also the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN], for his cooperation and help, and also to our ranking member on the full committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], for working with the subcommittee in bringing this bill out.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2798.

The question was taken.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1225

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on H.R. 2798, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### VETERANS' READJUSTMENT APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4384) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to Veterans' Readjustment Appointments.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4384

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. VETERANS' READJUSTMENT BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2014(b)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "GS-9" in clause (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "GS-11";

(2) by striking out "who is" in clause (C) and all that follows in that clause through "line of duty";

(3) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (C);

(4) by redesignating clause (D) as clause (E); and

(5) by inserting after clause (C) the following new clause:

"(D) a veteran of the Vietnam era who has more than 14 years of education and who is entitled to disability compensation under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or whose discharge or release from active duty was for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty shall be given a preference for such an appointment over other veterans of the Vietnam era who have more than 14 years of education; and"

(b) EXPIRATION DATE.—Section 2014(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking out

"September 30, 1986" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1991".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to appointments made after September 30, 1986.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4384, the Veterans' Readjustment Appointment Extension and Improvement Amendments of 1986.

The Veterans Readjustment Appointment [VRA] authority allows Federal agencies to hire Vietnam-era veterans without requiring them to compete on civil service registers. Subsequently, these veterans may convert to career or career-conditional appointments following 2 years of satisfactory employment and training.

The concept of the VRA authority was first instituted by Executive Order 11397, issued by President Lyndon Johnson on February 7, 1968, and further developed when President Nixon issued Executive Order 11521 in 1970. We on the Veterans' Affairs Committee consider the VRA Program one of the most successful veterans' employment programs available. The value and success of this program is clearly demonstrated by the 250,000 veterans of the Vietnam era who have entered the civil service under the VRA Program.

Under current law, the authority for the VRA Program expires on September 30, 1986, and legislative action is required to extend it. Under the provisions of H.R. 4384, the veterans' readjustment appointment authority would be extended until December 31, 1991.

In addition to extending the VRA authority, H.R. 4384 would improve the program by eliminating the restriction on education achievement for VRA appointees, maintaining the advantage which now exists for disabled veterans and raising the highest entry grade for VRA hires from GS-9 to GS-11. These provisions were contained in H.R. 1408, which was passed by the House last year. Unfortunately, the Senate has never acted on this bill. When I introduced H.R. 4384, I includ-



ed these provisions because I think we in the House want to again say to the other body that we support improved employment opportunities in the Federal Government for Vietnam veterans.

There are two features of the VRA Program that I think are important to emphasize. First, this program is cost effective. In fact, there are no costs associated with the VRA Program. These positions are regular civil service positions that count against an agency's staffing level.

Second, this is a voluntary program. Federal agencies are not legally obligated to use this hiring authority. I think I can probably speak for all my colleagues, however, when I say that we believe Federal agencies are morally obligated to use the VRA Program. The same Federal Government that asked its citizens to serve their country during the Vietnam era has a clear responsibility to assist these veterans in their efforts to find meaningful employment and to pursue a career. Additionally, those agencies who have made it a point to hire veterans under the VRA authority do so because they know they are hiring responsible, productive employees.

I particularly want to thank the chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY and JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, who are cosponsors of H.R. 4384, for their support and cooperation. I also want to thank all members of the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment, particularly BOB McEWEN, the distinguished ranking minority member.

Our Nation is obligated to assist Vietnam veterans who are seeking employment. It is also in the best interest of this Nation to encourage veterans to seek employment with the Federal Government. The VRA Program accomplishes both of these goals. I urge support for H.R. 4384.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, as ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, in strong support of H.R. 4384, a bill which I am pleased to cosponsor. This legislation would extend the very successful Veterans Readjustment Appointment [VRA] Program for 5 years and would widen participation opportunities for Vietnam-era veterans.

VRA has already given Federal career employment opportunities to a quarter of a million Vietnam-era veterans. We are not talking about a make-work program. These veterans fill existing Federal job vacancies, but they are not required to compete on the civil service register. A trial period of 2 years ensures that Government employers can eliminate unsatisfactory participants in the program, and

agency participation is strictly voluntary.

Most Federal agencies are participating, and they tell us they are extremely happy with the quality of employees they obtain under VRA.

Mr. Speaker, there is no cost to the VRA Program, because it involves only existing positions. Greater opportunities would be offered Vietnam-era veterans by increasing the highest possible entry grade from GS-9 to GS-11, and by removing the current limit of 14 years of education. The bill would maintain the current preference given to service-connected disabled veterans under VRA.

I commend Mr. DASCHLE, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, Training and Employment, and Mr. McEWEN, the ranking member of the subcommittee, for their leadership and work on behalf of H.R. 4384, and I would be remiss if I were not to thank Mr. MONTGOMERY, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this body passed these same provisions last year; however, the other body did not act. We should act again in another effort to preserve a worthy program for veterans. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 4384.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Appointment Program is a worthy and useful program, as already pointed out by my distinguished colleagues. The improvements we are recommending to the House today will enhance the success of the program, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer my strong support for H.R. 4384, the veterans readjustment appointment authority extensions and improvement bill. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], for shepherding this legislation through the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which he so ably chairs, and for bringing this measure to the House at this time.

The Veterans' Readjustment Appointment Program [VRA] was established in 1970, to help returning Vietnam veterans locate employment and begin to rebuild their lives and careers. Under this program, veterans serve a 2-year appointment in a Federal civilian job. If at the close of their tenure their job performance is found to be satisfactory and if they have acquired the necessary education and training, the veteran receives career or career-conditional status. This program grants preferences to our disabled, educationally disadvantaged veterans as well as to our veterans with service-connected disabilities.

H.R. 4384, extends the VRA Program through December 31, 1991, and makes some important changes which reflect the current job market. Presently participants of the VRA Program cannot be placed in positions exceeding a GS-9 level. I am pleased that the committee has recognized the need to readjust the wage scale and has, accordingly,

raised the maximum grade level of appointment from GS-9 to GS-11. This legislation also expands the prior eligibility standards, deleting the requirement that a veteran have no more than 14 years of education to be eligible for participation.

To date approximately 250,000 veterans have utilized the Veterans' Readjustment Appointment Program with an appointment rate of close to 80 percent. I hope that my colleagues will recognize the important service being offered to those who so willingly and courageously served our country and will support this veteran's readjustment reauthorization legislation.

On a similar note, I would also like to take this opportunity to speak in support of another piece of legislation also recently reported out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and considered in the House earlier today. H.R. 2798, the Veterans' Employment Rights Act prohibits employers from discriminating against members of the Reserves and the National Guard when making hiring decisions. While current law grants members of the Reserves and of the National Guard, the right to unpaid leaves of absence from civilian jobs to fulfill their military duties, there is no law on the books prohibiting employers from refusing to hire Reserve service personnel. Because the law forbids an employer from dismissing an employee because of absence for the fulfillment of Reserve obligations, many private-sector employers simply choose not to hire reservists.

Our Reserve Forces perform a vital role in the defense of our Nation—a defense that we all benefit from. It is crucial that private-sector employers be prohibited from engaging in any discriminatory hiring practices regarding reservists. Accordingly I am pleased that my colleagues offered their strong support earlier today for this bill.

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi, for providing this opportunity to discuss these measures. I entreat my colleagues not to forget the tremendous contributions made by those who have served and continue to serve in a Reserve capacity, as members of our Armed Forces.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4384.

The question was taken.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on H.R. 4384, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

□ 1235

KLAMATH INDIAN TRIBE  
RESTORATION ACT

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3554) to provide for the restoration of the Federal trust relationship with, and Federal services and assistance to, the Klamath Tribe of Indians and the individual members thereof consisting of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3554

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Klamath Indian Tribe Restoration Act".

## SEC. 2. RESTORATION OF FEDERAL RECOGNITION, RIGHTS, AND PRIVILEGES.

(a) FEDERAL RECOGNITION.—Notwithstanding any provision of law, Federal recognition is hereby extended to the tribe and to members of the tribe. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all laws and regulations of the United States of general application to Indians or nations, tribes, or bands of Indians which are not inconsistent with any specific provision of this Act shall be applicable to the tribe and its members.

(b) RESTORATION OF RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES.—All rights and privileges of the tribe and the members of the tribe under any Federal treaty, Executive order, agreement, or statute, or any other Federal authority, which may have been diminished or lost under the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Klamath Tribe of Indians located in the State of Oregon and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes", approved August 13, 1954 (25 U.S.C. 564 et seq.), are restored, and the provisions of such Act to the extent that they are inconsistent with this Act, shall be inapplicable to the tribe and to members of the tribe after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) FEDERAL SERVICES AND BENEFITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the tribe and its members shall be eligible, on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, for all Federal services and benefits furnished to federally recognized Indian tribes or their members without regard to the existence of a reservation for the tribe. In the case of Federal services available to members of federally recognized Indian tribes residing on or near a reservation, members of the tribe residing in Klamath

County shall be deemed to be residing in or near a reservation. Any member residing in Klamath County shall continue to be eligible to receive any such Federal service notwithstanding the establishment of a reservation for the tribe in the future. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the tribe shall be considered an Indian tribe for the purpose of the "Indian Tribal Government Tax Status Act" (Sec. 7871, I.R.C. 1954).

(d) CERTAIN RIGHTS NOT ALTERED.—Nothing in this Act shall alter any property right or obligation, any contractual right or obligation, or any obligation for taxes already levied.

(e) This Act does not apply to the members of the Modoc Indian Tribe of Oklahoma as recognized under section 2(a) of the Act of May 15, 1978 (92 Stat. 246) and the Klamath Tribe of Indians does not (except for the purposes set out in section 2(a)(1) of that Act) include the members of the Modoc Indian Tribe of Oklahoma.

## SEC. 3. TRIBE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS.

The tribe's constitution and bylaws shall remain in full force and effect and nothing in this Act shall affect the power of the General Council to take any action under the Constitution by Bylaws.

## SEC. 4. CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the tribe's previous rejection of the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), upon written request of the General Council, the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special election pursuant to section 18 of such Act to determine if such Act should be applicable to the tribe.

(b) ADOPTION OF CONSTITUTION.—Upon written request of the General Council, the Secretary shall conduct an election pursuant to section 16 of the Act approved on June 18, 1934 (43 Stat. 987; 25 U.S.C. 476), for the purpose of adopting a new constitution for the tribe.

## SEC. 5. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, AND WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act shall affect in any manner any hunting, fishing, trapping, gathering, or water right of the tribe and its members.

## SEC. 6. TRANSFER OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

The Secretary shall accept real property for the benefit of the tribe if conveyed or otherwise transferred to the Secretary. Such property shall be subject to all valid existing rights including liens, outstanding taxes (local and State), and mortgages. Subject to the conditions imposed by this section, the land transferred shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe and shall be part of their reservation. The transfer of real property authorized by this section shall be exempt from all local, State, and Federal taxation as of the date of transfer.

## SEC. 7. CRIMINAL AND CIVIL JURISDICTION.

The State shall exercise criminal and civil jurisdiction within the boundaries of the reservation, in accordance with section 1162 of title 18, United States Code, and section 1360 of title 28, United States Code, respectively.

## SEC. 8. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

(a) PLAN FOR ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY.—The Secretary shall—

(1)(A) enter into negotiations with the Executive Committee of the General Council with respect to establishing a plan for economic development for the tribe; and

(B) in accordance with this section and not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop such a plan.

(2) Upon the approval of such plan by the General Council (and after consultation with the State and local officials pursuant to subsection (b)), the Secretary shall submit such plan to the Congress.

(b) CONSULTATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS REQUIRED.—To assure that legitimate State and local interests are not prejudiced by the proposed economic self-sufficiency plan, the Secretary shall notify and consult with the appropriate officials of the State and all appropriate local governmental officials in the State. The Secretary shall provide complete information on the proposed plan to such officials, including the restrictions on such proposed plan imposed by subsection (c). During any consultation by the Secretary under this subsection, the Secretary shall provide such information as the Secretary may possess, and shall request comments and additional information on the extent of any State or local service to the tribe.

(c) RESTRICTIONS TO BE CONTAINED IN PLAN.—Any plan developed by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall provide that—

(1) any real property transferred by the tribe or any member to the Secretary shall be taken and held in the name of the United States for the benefit of the tribe;

(2) any real property taken in trust by the Secretary pursuant to such plan shall be subject to—

(A) all legal rights and interests in such land existing at the time of the acquisition of such land by the Secretary, including any lien, mortgage, or previously levied and outstanding State or local tax; and

(B) foreclosure or sale in accordance with the laws of the State pursuant to the terms of any valid obligation in existence at the time of the acquisition of such land by the Secretary;

(3) any real property transferred pursuant to such plan shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation of any kind.

(d) APPENDIX TO PLAN SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall append to the plan submitted to the Congress under subsection (a) a detailed statement—

(1) naming each individual and official consulted in accordance with subsection (b);

(2) summarizing the testimony received by the Secretary pursuant to any such consultation; and

(3) including any written comments or reports submitted to the Secretary by any party named in paragraph (1).

## SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act the following definitions apply:

(1) The term "tribe" means the Klamath Tribe consisting of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes of Oregon and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.

(2) The term "member" means those persons eligible for enrollment under the Constitution and Bylaws of the Klamath Tribe.

(3) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior or his designated representative.

(4) The term "State" means the State of Oregon.

(5) The term "Constitution and Bylaws" means the Constitution and Bylaws of the Klamath Tribe of Indians in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.



(6) The term "General Council" means the governing body of the tribe under the Constitution and Bylaws.

#### SEC. 10. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary may make such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3554, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3554 is a bill which would provide for the restoration of the Federal trust relationship with the Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon.

Prior to 1954, the Klamath Tribe was a federally recognized tribe and had a 1.9-million-acre reservation which it reserved to itself in a 1864 treaty with the United States. In 1954, however, Congress enacted the Klamath Termination Act. Pursuant to this act, the tribal reservation was sold and the tribal members lost their eligibility to participate in Federal programs available to Indians because of their status as Indians.

After 1954, the Klamath Tribe did not cease to exist and the tribal government continued to operate even though it was no longer recognized as such by the Federal Government.

The termination act was passed not because of tribal support but of the "termination" policy then in effect. This policy was a failure and has not been repudiated by the United States.

The Klamath Indians are in full support of H.R. 3554. The administration also supports the bill. The bill would not restore to the tribe its reservation and does not contain any authorization for new appropriations. The bill would restore the government-to-government relationship between the tribe and the United States and would make the tribal members eligible to benefit from Federal programs avail-

able to other Indians because of their status as federally recognized Indians.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no known opposition to this bill and therefore I urge the Members to support passage of the bill.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3554, the Klamath Tribal Restoration Act; I commend our colleague from Oregon, the Honorable BOB SMITH, for introducing H.R. 3554, a bill which would restore to the Klamath Tribe and its members all rights and privileges lost under the Termination Act of August 13, 1954. I believe this is another important step of rectifying a failed policy—that of termination. During our hearing on H.R. 3554 we heard testimony from the tribal officials, the academic researchers, and the administration—all in support of H.R. 3554. The administration suggested several technical and clarifying amendments, which were incorporated into H.R. 3554 at the committee level.

The struggle has been long for the tribe. Again, I commend my colleague, BOB SMITH; and I urge all Members to support H.R. 3554.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH].

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this bill, H.R. 3554, legislation to restore the historic tribal status of the Klamath Indian Tribe in my Second District of Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, allow me at the outset to make it clear that this bill would not restore land to the Klamath Tribe's reservation, nor would it suggest that the Federal Government should ever provide land for a reservation.

I, personally, would not support Federal legislation to create a new reservation. If it is the tribal chiefs' intention to reconstruct a reservation in the future, it must be done through the same land acquisition methods available to any American.

Nor would this bill have any impact on the tribal hunting and fishing rights which exist under law.

But this bill would accomplish something extremely important: it will return to the Klamath Indians their historic identity, the one-of-a-kind niche which this tribe deserves in America.

It's a niche that was lost with the termination of tribal status and the selling of the reservation in 1954, when—in all good intentions, I'm sure—our Government convinced many American Indian tribes to do the same.

Called mainstreaming, the idea was to bring the American Indian fully into the "melting pot" of America.

In 1954, tribal lands were sold, tribal members were given cash awards, and the traditional trust relationship between the U.S. Government and the Klamath Tribe was terminated.

Admittedly, in the years since 1954, there has been plenty of discussion about the original terms.

Hindsight being so much more precise than foresight, I think there's an inevitability in the questions that have cropped up since then: was the price paid for land a fair one; were the terms accepted generous enough; were tribal members coerced or unfairly cajoled into an agreement by more sophisticated Government negotiators?

I admit those questions are inevitable. But it isn't the place of this Congress to rewrite history. What was done then in the way of compensation, will not be undone by this bill or by any future bill with my name or my support behind it.

What can and should be undone, however, was the loosening of ethnic ties which had existed in the Klamath Tribe for centuries.

We've discovered that "mainstreaming" tribal organization really amounts to the loss of tribal identity and the loss of cultures and heritage which are uniquely American in nature and impossible to recapture.

The Klamath Tribe wants to perpetuate the heritage and values that have bound members of their tribe in spirit for generations.

This bill will tighten those ties once more, just as tribal restoration has done for other tribes in Oregon and across America.

It will reinstate the eligibility of Klamath tribal members to receive Federal social, educational, and economic programs which are available to all members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

That recognition alone will open the door to many of the opportunities which the U.S. Government has offered over the years.

Most important among them is the chance for Klamath children to receive a decent education and for tribal members to benefit by adequate health care.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is entirely in keeping with the historical precedents of United States dealings with our native Indian tribes.

I'm pleased to mention that the bill is cosponsored by three fellow Members of Oregon's delegation in this House, by Oregon's Governor, local, city, and county governments where the majority of the tribal members live.

I urge you to act favorably on this bill.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WEAVER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3554, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK ADDITION

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4259, to amend the act of February 11, 1895 (28 Stat. 651), to authorize the donation of certain non-Federal lands within the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4259

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall accept on behalf of the United States, the donation of approximately 31 acres of land known as the "Taney Farm" for administration as part of the Gettysburg National Military Park in Pennsylvania if such land is offered to be conveyed to the United States without cost to the United States by the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association. Upon acceptance of title thereto by the United States, such property shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the park.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4259, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4259 would authorize the donation by the nonprofit Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association of a 31-acre parcel, known as the Taney Farm, for inclusion within Gettysburg National Military Park. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER], a member of the Interior and Insular

Affairs Committee and the sponsor of this commonsense proposal.

The Taney Farm is located immediately adjacent to the existing administrative park boundary. According to the testimony of the National Park Service's Chief Historian and others, the farm was of strategic importance during the later part of the Battle of Gettysburg on July 2 and 3, 1863, serving as the staging ground for the Confederate assault of the Union's position on Culp's Hill. A 1978 report of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation identified the Taney Farm as a "critical area."

I want to point out to Members that the farm is within the congressionally authorized lands for the park. The enabling legislation establishing the park in 1895 noted that land for the park may not exceed in area the parcels shown on the map prepared by Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Sickles, and such other adjacent lands as may be necessary to preserve the important topographical features of the battlefield. The Taney Farm is one of the parcels identified on the Sickles map.

In 1974, the National Park Service developed an administrative plan for the park's boundary that was a modification of the Sickles map. This plan has served as an unofficial guide for the park's boundary for the last 12 years. It is important to note that the 1974 administrative plan for the park's boundary was never enacted by Congress. As such, the boundary provisions of the 1895 act remain in force.

The fact of the matter here is that this legislation makes the Taney Farm donation pass additional muster. The National Park Service, which supports H.R. 4259, has authority to accept the donation under existing law but is hesitant to do so because of the continuing questions regarding the overall boundary of the park. The Park Service has recently undertaken a study of the historical lands associated with the Battle of Gettysburg to provide future guidance on where the park's boundary lines should rest.

While there may be questions with the overall boundary of the park, no one questions the historical appropriateness of this particular track to the park. This is not an indiscriminate addition to the park, rather it involves land that is important historically and geographically to the park. The property itself will be conveyed to the Federal Government at no cost and it contains no structures which would require perpetual care. Further, this addition will not detract from the local tax base, since the land is already tax-exempt because of its ownership by a nonprofit organization.

We have here the opportunity to add, at no cost to the Federal Government, a parcel that is part of the story of the Battle of Gettysburg. This measure has the strong support of the

U.S. National Park Service and the administration as well as bipartisan support of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I urge support of the House.

I urge adoption of the measure.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to comment on H.R. 4259, the bill before us today.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has explained, this bill would authorize the donation of a 31-acre land parcel to the National Park Service to become a part of Gettysburg National Military Park. While I agree on the merits of this legislation and believe it should move forward, I would also like to express a concern on this issue which I share with the Member who represents the Gettysburg area, Mr. GOODLING. The concern is simply, that as Gettysburg Park, and in fact many of our national parks, continue to grow, the local tax bases are adversely affected.

Unfortunately, a legislative boundary has never been established for Gettysburg Park. When the park was created in 1895, the authorizing legislation recommended the acquisition of the parcels of land indicated on a map prepared by Maj. Gen. Daniel E. Sickles of the U.S. Army. However, the parcels were not clearly delineated on the map, creating a great deal of ambiguity in later years as to the actual intent of Congress regarding the boundary. In 1974, Senator Alan Bible, chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, negotiated an administrative boundary with the National Park Service for Gettysburg Park. However, this boundary was never established through legislation. The land parcel in H.R. 4259 is adjacent to the 1974 administrative boundary.

In an effort to prevent hodgepodge donations to the park and further erosion of the tax base, I strongly believe that Congress should establish a permanent boundary for Gettysburg Park. The National Park Service has indicated it is currently studying this issue and will submit recommendations to Congress next year. I would hope that Congress could act on a permanent boundary proposal at that time.

While I recognize the merits of H.R. 4259 and support its passage, I would hope that this body will not authorize any additional land donations to the Gettysburg Park outside of the 1974 administrative boundary until a permanent boundary can be thoroughly considered and established.



Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take my colleagues for a moment back to July 2, 1863, on that sultry summer afternoon.

Shortly after 4 o'clock, General Lee made the decision to move against the Union line entrenched in defensive positions at Gettysburg, PA.

He directed Gen. James Longstreet, a fellow Virginian, to move against the Union left. Gen. George Meade, a Pennsylvanian, ordered the Union left reinforced and directed that all but one brigade be diverted from the defense of Culp's Hill to the Union left.

This lone brigade defending Culp's Hill was commanded by the Union brigade general, George Green.

Now the Confederates saw an opening. If they could take Culp's Hill, beyond which lay the Baltimore Pike, the road that constituted the Union rear, the Yankees would be outflanked and be forced to withdraw from Gettysburg. Thus, the struggle to seize Culp's Hill became, in the words of Edmund Beavss the historian of the National Park Service, "the crucial engagement of Gettysburg."

At the foot of the hill lay the Taney Farm.

At 7:30 that night, Confederate General "Maryland" Stuart led the first assault on Culp's Hill. Stuart's Confederates crossed the Rock Creek, seizing the Union earthworks in the area of Spangler Springs and the Taney Farm. The late Civil War historian Bruce Catton described the subsequent action in his classic work on Gettysburg, "Glory Road."

Four times the Rebels surged up the slope through the trees, a solid division of first rate troops, and each time the fire over the trees drove them back. Yet part of the Union line, which ran through low ground southeast of the hill, was overrun, and as the darkness came down the Union position here was still insecure. It was certain as anything could be that the Confederate attack would be renewed at dawn.

During the night, however, the Union 12th Corps returned to reinforce Green on Culp's Hill. Before dawn on July 3—the final day of the battle, the rebels attacked but were stopped cold by the strengthened Union line. Led by the 2d Massachusetts Regiment, nicknamed the "Harvard Brigade," and the 27th Indiana Regiment, the Yankees counterattacked.

They drove the Confederates from the base of Culp's Hill, back across the Taney Farm, suffering terrible losses in the process. As Catton described the action, "The two regiments put up a cheer and charged out into the little meadow. There were three rebel brigades within range, concealed among trees and rocks, and they cut loose

with what wintry-faced old Colonel Colgrove of the Indiana Regiment later described as one of the most destructive fires I ever witnessed. But by mid-morning Stuart's troops had been completely driven back and Culp's Hill and the Union left was secured."

It was on the Taney Farm and nearby Spangler's Meadow at the foot of Culp's Hill that hundreds of northerners and southerners alike fell.

It is this land, the Taney Farm itself, that H.R. 4259 would save.

After the bloody struggle on the evening of July 2, and the morning of the 3d, the Taney Farm became the site of one of the largest field hospitals at Gettysburg. Union doctors attended northern and southern wounded alike—with many from both sides dying on the operating tables because of the horrendous medical care available during the war.

Still later, Taney Farm became the site of the first battlefield marker at Gettysburg—the first of hundreds of such monuments to the armies of both sides. The survivors of the 2d Massachusetts Regiment erected a marker on the Taney Farm to commemorate the heroic counterattack of their comrades on the morning of July 3, 1863.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Taney Farm and the 31 acres on which it is situated currently belong to the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association. The association wishes to contribute it to the United States. H.R. 4259 authorizes that transfer of land.

Two final points, Mr. Speaker. First, the addition of these 31 acres will not exceed the boundary limits of 3,874 acres now set.

Second, Mr. Speaker, this will not cost the Federal Government anything, nor will it cost the local municipality anything, since this land is not currently on the tax rolls.

Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1863, President Lincoln traveled to Gettysburg from Washington. He spoke to a crowd of about 30,000 that day, delivering the Gettysburg Address. We have the opportunity this afternoon to renew President Lincoln's words and renew the deeds of those brave men who died there, by passing H.R. 4259.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the battlefield at Gettysburg is a national treasure, the American people know it to be a national treasure, the people of Pennsylvania, even more importantly, know it to be a national treasure, and certainly the people of the area of Gettysburg know it to be a national treasure. It is far more of a treasure for those people who live there than for anyone else. They know what it is they have. The

trouble is, with this bill that we have before us, no one bothered to consult with the people of Gettysburg, no one could care what the people of Gettysburg think.

Mr. Speaker, the Representative from that area says flatly that he opposes this bill because it represents a concern about expansion of the battlefield that could ultimately have adverse economic consequences for that area that he represents. Many people in that area do know what is involved in this, and they do not want the expansion. It seems to me that somewhere along the line we ought to pay a little bit of attention to the people of these areas. This Congress has a propensity toward ignoring the wishes of the people of the area that we tend to govern. We do it time and time again; the Member of Congress from an area comes to the floor and suggests that this is not good for his area, that the people do not want it, and we say "We know better." Uncle Sam knows better than the people of the area what is good for them. So they drive it down their throats. We do it on wilderness land, we do it often on national park lands. That is precisely what we are doing here. It is Uncle Sam versus the people.

When we read the letter of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who proposed this bill, he tells us that the bill is wanted by the National Park Service and by the Department of the Interior. That is not the people of Gettysburg. That is big government. Big government is saying to the people of Gettysburg they want it. When we read that it has been approved by the subcommittee, well, the subcommittee is Uncle Sam in Washington; that is not the people of Gettysburg.

It was approved unanimously by the Interior Committee. The Interior Committee is not the people of Gettysburg; that is the people right here in Washington.

This is Washington versus Gettysburg, is what it amounts to. The people of Gettysburg do not want it, the people in Washington say "You'll take it anyway."

I think that that kind of arrogance is of highly questionable validity on the House floor. It seems to me that somewhere along the line we ought to consult with the people of the area, and we ought to take their views into account as we do some of these kinds of things. Why, for example, is this bill being brought to us by someone who lives several counties away from Gettysburg? Why did not the people who propose to have this happen go to the Member of Congress from that area? Why did they not go to people closer? The point being that the Member from Gettysburg, the Member who represents that area says flatly the people there do not want it.

He knows the people best. Why do we not listen to the Representative of the people around here? Why is it always the bureaucrats and powerful leaders in this Congress who have to say to the Representatives of the people "Well, you don't matter in all this."

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman could tell me where the membership of the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association lives? This is the group which came to me and asked me to introduce the legislation. I wonder if the gentleman knows where their membership lives.

Mr. WALKER. Well, the gentleman probably has more information about that than I do because the gentleman deals directly with them. I would say to the gentleman, however, I think the membership—

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I wonder if the gentleman would allow me, would continue to yield and allow me to finish my question.

Mr. WALKER. I thought the gentleman wanted an answer. But if he does not, I continue to yield.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. May I finish my question?

It was the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, a local organization in Adams County, Gettysburg, PA, that suggested to me the introduction of this legislation. They live in the area.

Mr. WALKER. Well, this gentleman wondered though why they did not suggest that to their local Congressman, the man who represents them in this body.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

If the gentleman will allow me to respond, before I introduced the legislation I visited with our colleague and our friend, BILL GOODLING. I asked him if he had any objection to the bill. He said he did not.

Shortly after that, he came back to me and said he had spoken with the borough manager of Gettysburg who objected to the additional 31 acres.

□ 1300

But it was the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association, a local group, which requested the introduction of the bill.

If I may say one final thing to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in this morning's edition of the Gettysburg Times, which is the largest newspaper in that congressional dis-

trict, this bill is endorsed and supported.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would just make the point to the gentleman that once again, what the gentleman has just told the House is the Representative of the area went back and checked with the local people and the local people told the gentleman, no, they did not want this.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will let me make a statement on my own time here, it would be very helpful. I allowed the gentleman the time. Just let me reply, if I may.

What the gentleman has now told us is that the Representative of this Congress from the area went back to the people of the area and found out they did not want the bill. That is the reason why the gentleman is opposed.

We have a letter here from our colleague who represents the area that says the gentleman is opposed and the people of the area are opposed.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to the gentleman that the point still stands. The preservation society which the gentleman mentions probably is headquartered in the area. That would seem logical. It is also an association, as I understand it, that has a broad base beyond the area and raises its money from outside the area. So it is not necessarily totally representative of all of the people of Gettysburg.

It is my feeling that somewhere along the line when people get elected to this body to represent their district, their opinion on behalf of the people of those districts ought to be taken into account. That is this gentleman's only point, that if we have elected Representatives of the people here in the body, they ought to be able to speak for their folks in this body. We ought not have Congress constantly coming along and departments and agencies constantly coming along telling the people of various areas, no, you do not count.

That is exactly what we are saying with this bill. We are saying to the people of that particular part of Pennsylvania, "No, you don't count. Washington knows better. We in our bureaucratic wisdom, we in our congressional wisdom, know better than you do what is good for your area, and you take this or you leave it."

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the concern that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has taken in this issue, I am puzzled as to why the gentleman who so ably represents this district, the gentleman

from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is not here with us today, if the gentleman is so fired up in opposition to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, finally, as I did a moment ago, that this legislation originated with a local group, people who live, work, and pay taxes in Gettysburg, the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association. It is endorsed and supported by the largest newspaper in that district.

That apparently is not acceptable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. I do not know why. I do not know why these people are somehow less aware of the feelings of the people in that area than he.

This, finally, is not strictly a local issue. It is a national issue as well. I hope that the House will agree to the legislation.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we had a full hearing in the subcommittee on this. Of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] did participate in that. I know the gentleman's absence today in no way indicates his interest in this particular legislation. I know the gentleman is deeply interested in the issue.

Finally, I would say that we did have a full hearing on this, and there are differences locally in the Gettysburg area with regard to the direction we should take. I would just point out that we have to make decisions on this. It is an important addition, an important parcel to the park in the 1895 boundary, within that boundary. In fact, I think some could interpret that this legislation is not necessary, that this could be added without it.

But in fact, we are going through the legislative process again to provide for a full airing and the full authority so that there is no misunderstanding about it.

But we do care about what is happening. Gettysburg is a very important area in terms of tourism in that area, and what happens in the park is immensely important to their total economy.

This parcel, incidentally, is not located in the town of Gettysburg, but in Adams County adjacent to it. We are going to look carefully at these parcels that are added so that they do not have the type of consequence that is adverse.

I just wanted to share that with the body, because there has been some suggestion that we did not care about what the local people feel. That is not my thought. It is not the sentiment of our committee or of the members. I do not want that impression to be left.



Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that both the citizens of Adams County, PA, and I are proud of the history and heritage which the Gettysburg National Military Park represents. It is very much a worthwhile tribute to this troubling time in our Nation's history, as well as serving as a wonderful natural setting for visitors.

Despite my strong support for the park, I have a number of concerns about the bill my colleague from Pennsylvania has chosen to introduce and bring before the House today.

On the face of it, the legislation might appear as a reasonable proposal, primarily because it appears to simply donate, free of charge, a 31-acre tract of land known as the Taney Farm to the Federal Government for the Gettysburg National Military Park.

Frankly, it's just not that simple.

Confusion about the Gettysburg National Military Park was brought about by its original enabling legislation enacted in 1895. This law provided a map showing a park in excess of 5,000 acres. However, the law limited the size of the park to 3,874 acres.

This confusion was settled by a May 24, 1974, agreement between the National Park Service and Senator Alan Bible after a study by the Park Service. This study noted the boundaries of the park have been—

Reviewed within the Service to assure that the historic resources and character of these areas are preserved and are firm and no longer subject to any administrative adjustment or alteration.

The Bible agreement thus limited the park to 3,874 acres.

Senator Bible, in approaching the study, directed the Park Service that—

Implicit in this approval is the firm understanding that the depicted boundaries will not be subject to change in the future except for substantial and compelling reasons.

H.R. 4259 will abrogate this agreement.

Moreover, this legislation will establish a precedent for the park and the surrounding communities which greatly concerns me. Perhaps if this piece of land were the only land that will be acquired by the park, it might truly be a reasonable acquisition. I fear, however, that this is just the first step of a new effort by the Park Service to significantly expand the park once again.

In this regard, the Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association [GBPA], the group donating the Taney property, openly touts its desire for the park. In a brochure seeking funds for its efforts, the GBPA states:

The purchase of the Taney Farm is just a first step, and highlights an urgent need to obtain public support to continue the GBPA's efforts. In addition to assisting the park in purchasing the remaining 250 acres of land authorized by Congress to be included in Gettysburg National Park, the GBPA sees even a larger need to make the public aware of more than 1,000 acres of land not included in the park boundaries, but vitally important in protecting the historic landscape.

Certainly, there may well be pieces of land with viable historical background which should belong to the park. But must every foot of land upon which a Union or Confederate soldier stepped be acquired for the park?

Similarly, I am concerned about the long-range effects of an enlarged park on the surrounding communities. The Taney property will not hurt the tax base because it already belongs to a nonprofit group. But imagine the effect on these small townships if 1,000 acres are no longer available to assist local governments. Already, Cumberland Township, which lies north, south, and west of the park has 21 percent of its tax base reserved due the park and church rights. Similarly, 45 percent of the borough of Gettysburg is preserved from taxes due to the park and other local obligations.

The National Park Service has indicated that it is undertaking a study to provide a plan for the future development of the park. It does not make sense to me to begin further expansion of the Gettysburg National Military Park in the haphazard process H.R. 4259 will begin. I ask my colleagues in the House to consider the views of the citizens of Adams County who will be affected by this legislation when they vote on this matter. Ninety-five percent of the people in Adams County resent the continued expansion of the park, taking property off the tax rolls, raising the price of farmland dramatically and taking away the possibility of growth in the area. I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4259.

The question was taken.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA WILDERNESS AMENDMENTS

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4348) to amend the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness law to change the authorizations of appropriations for resource management review and grants.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4348

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATIONS.

Section 6(d) of the Act entitled "An Act to designate the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, to establish the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Mining Protection Area, and for other purposes", approved October 21, 1978 (92 Stat. 1653), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking out "\$8,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$6,000,000"; and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking out "\$3,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000".

#### SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 1 shall take effect October 1, 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4348, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4348 would authorize a revenue neutral shift of \$2 million in authorization from the Federal forestry intensification provision of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-495) to the State and private forestry provisions of that same law.

Section 6(d) of Public Law 95-495 authorized a 10-year forestry intensification program on Federal, State, county, and private timberlands adjacent to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. H.R. 4348 would amend that provision effective October 1, 1987, by decreasing the authorization for the Federal Forestry Intensification Program from \$8 million to \$6 million, and by increasing the State, county, and private forestry intensification program from \$3 to \$5 million. This small shift in authorization will help better reflect the reality of development that has occurred since the 1978 act, and maximize the benefits during the remaining 4 years of the program.

The change in authorizations will not impact on the historical pattern of forestry spending on Federal lands outside the BWCA, but will better allocate resources for the efforts being out forth under the cooperative forestry program, which, incidentally, is done on a cost-sharing basis—80-20.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the testimony the committee received gave evidence to the high level of cooperation that is being put forth by Federal, State, and local participants in the program. As many Members may recall, the 1978 BWCA Act was a divisive issue. Through programs such as forestry intensification, the purposes of the act are being met. The management program we have estab-

lished for the BWCA has made it one of the flagships of our wilderness system.

I urge adoption of H.R. 4348.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments on H.R. 4348.

As you know, this bill would decrease the authorization for Federal forestry intensification activities from \$8 million to \$6 million and increase the authorization for State, county, and private forestry intensification activities from \$3 million to \$5 million. While it is apparent that the counties in northern Minnesota have managed their forest land very well due in large part to the Federal assistance provided annually under the 1978 Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act [BWCA], I have a few concerns about the possible ramifications of this bill.

First, it alters a compromise which was developed when the BWCA legislation was passed by Congress. Not only does this upset the balance between existing Federal and State programs, but it also establishes a dangerous precedent to amend previous compromises on other issues.

In addition, by increasing the authorization for this State grant program, other Forest Service cooperative forestry programs could be deprived of necessary funding.

Having expressed these concerns, I recognize the reasons for this legislation and do not object to its passage. However, prior to final congressional action, I would urge that all aspects of the issue be thoroughly considered.

□ 1310

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], who has worked diligently the past years since the enactment of the 1978 law. He has done an outstanding job of representing the interests of that area, especially, I think, before the Appropriations Committee in seeking funds to implement this act. I have been happy to work with him in that endeavor. The changes or modifications here are, in large measure, due to his advocacy and the success of this program in no small part is due to his work with local governments pointing out the positive aspects of this particular policy. Although not agreeing fundamentally with all the changes that were initiated at that time, he certainly has worked in a good-faith manner to ensure and see that this law has borne the fruit and has been as much benefit to his area.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my very great appreciation for the speed with which the subcommittee, under the leadership of the gentleman from

Minnesota has moved with this legislation, giving it a full hearing, analyzing all aspects of the legislation, bringing it through committee and to the House floor in an expeditious manner.

I also want to express my appreciation to the Members of the minority side of the committee who have taken a careful look at the legislation, particularly the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], who has spent quite some time in thinking it through, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], who sat through the committee hearings, and raised pertinent questions and ultimately expressed his support for the legislation.

The gentleman from New Mexico has raised a valid point of question, perhaps two questions, about the legislation. He expressed concern about ramifications, first, that it alters the basic law, boundary waters canoe area wilderness law, in a way that may set a dangerous precedent. It may set a precedent, but I do not think it is a dangerous one. It is one that recognizes the reality of what has happened in the wake of passage of the Boundary Waters Wilderness Act since 1978.

Timber harvesting practices and the needs of the wood fiber industry in Minnesota have changed significantly in the years since 1978, I would say to my colleague. The industry is now using more aspen wood for its requirements than soft woods, and the aspen is found in greater concentration on lands outside the Superior National Forest and outside the Chippewa National Forest. Those lands are largely in county and State ownership. It makes sense to turn the focus of increased harvesting of that species away from the Federal forestry lands and onto these underutilized State and county lands where a greater yield can be offered and the needs of the wood fiber industry satisfied.

The basic act recognized that creating wilderness would take lands out of wood fiber production within the area of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It, therefore, provided for two kinds of compensatory actions: First, intensifying forestry on Federal lands; and second, intensifying forestry on State and county lands. It now appears a wise move to shift that authorization from the Federal lands onto the State and county lands.

The second point the gentleman raised is that other programs within the U.S. Forest Service might be deprived of funds. Let us face that openly. From the outset, I have said: First, this is a revenue-neutral amendment; second, it is not intended in the appropriation process to diminish funds for any other program but, within the overall context of our budget limitations, to attempt to increase the funding for State and county forestry. That would be my purpose in seeking appropriations.

So the purpose of H.R. 4348 is very straightforward and unmistakable. At least I have tried to make it unmistakable and as clear as possible in a sensitive issue of this kind, that the bill proposes a revenue-neutral shift of \$2 million in authorization from the Federal forestry provision of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act of 1978 to the State and private forestry provisions of the same law. I think I have fairly well clarified the purpose.

If the gentleman has any further questions, I would be glad to respond to the gentleman.

Mr. LUJAN. No. As a matter of fact, I see why we need such legislation. I was reiterating the questions that have been asked before.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I think entirely properly so.

Mr. LUJAN. In order to press those issues before the full House. I must tell the gentleman I do not oppose his bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman.

The purpose of H.R. 4348 is to authorize a revenue-neutral shift of \$2 million in authorization from the Federal forestry provision of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act of 1978 to the State and private forestry provision of that same law.

The shift is needed to keep pace with changes in species utilization within the wood fiber industry since enactment of that law. The focus of the wood fiber industry has shifted since 1978 from softwood harvesting principally on Federal forest lands to hardwood harvesting on State and county lands. The authorization level provided in section 6(d)(1) of Public Law 95-495 has never been fully used nor is that authorization any longer needed for the purpose originally intended. However, funds are needed to carry out one of the purposes of the act: to intensify wood fiber yield and production outside the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and beyond the Superior National Forest.

The timber stand improvement and yield intensification programs carried out on State and county lands have constituted the major portion of the BWCA appropriation every year since enactment. This Federal appropriation has funded three program areas, the national forest program on the Superior and Chippewa National Forests, the grant to the State of Minnesota for forest intensification programs on State, county, and private lands, and a third program funding research projects and studies.

The national forest program has utilized the funding principally for two activities, reforestation and timber stand improvement and for road forest work. Accomplishments of this program in the Superior Forest, for the period fiscal years 1980 through 1986



includes the reforestation of 19,238 acres, timber stand improvement of 10,470 acres, construction of 150.6 miles, and the resurfacing of 169.9 miles.

Similar successes can be found in the Chippewa National Forest, where 2,333 acres have been reforested since 1980; timber stand improvements have been made to 4,019 acres; 79.8 miles have been constructed and 108 miles have been resurfaced.

The total cost of section 6 funding under Public Law 96-495 since fiscal year 1980 has been \$29.3 million. Under section 6(d)(1) of Public Law 95-495, the Federal Government is authorized at levels not to exceed \$8 million. However, the U.S. Forest Service has never sought nor have there ever been appropriations even approaching that amount. The largest amount ever appropriated under section 6(d)(1) was \$5.8 million, designated in fiscal year 1981. Since that time we have seen a steady decrease in Federal funds allotted to the Public Law 95-495 forestry intensification program. In fiscal year 1986, the section 6(d)(1) program received only \$2.49 million.

The same legislation authorization that \$3 million be designated at the State and local level, under section 6(d)(2). In each year that full amount has been utilized by State and country governments to manage the 7 million acres of forest land in the region. Every cent has been used to plant more acres, improve existing plantations, and invest in the region's forest road network.

In the period including fiscal years 1984 through 1985, 7.2 miles have been constructed and 2 more are expected to be constructed in fiscal year 1986 and 1,113.2 miles have been resurfaced in that same period with 570 expected to be maintained this year. Reforestation occurred on 28,287 acres in those 2 years and 41.4 million seedlings were planted.

Again, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4348 is a straightforward piece of legislation that addresses the need to expand our timber industry and the need to adhere to budgetary guidelines. The effect of enacting this legislation will be a positive sign or northeastern Minnesota that Congress intends to follow through on its promise to make amends for inconveniences caused by the Wilderness Act. At the same time, H.R. 4348 will continue growth and development at the State and county level.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the fact is, this just demonstrates, I think, what is a successful model in terms of forestry intensification with the cooperative private Federal type of activity, and I would suggest that I think when we find something that is working, it does not hurt to try and give it a little bit more authorization, especially in

terms of shifting it around. I think the real result here is that indeed there will be, in other words, insofar as the gentleman from Minnesota and myself, and others, can encourage appropriation dollars to fill out that authorization, but I think we ought to be free to compete on the basis of the merit that this program has and the way that it functions. And we ought to have that freedom to compete for those dollars on that basis, especially when this money leverages as well as it does. So I think it is a very good program. We ought to consider it as a tool that we often face in terms of the economic development fallout that occurs when we designate certain conservation units and shift around the use of those lands.

It is a good example, and I think that is why we are responding in this. I think the fact is this is the first time we have amended the law since 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4348.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMENDING THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF BERLIN FOR COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BERLIN OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 325) to commend the government and the people of Berlin for keeping alive the spirit of equality, freedom, and human dignity through their solemn commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Jesse Owens' victories at the 1936 Berlin Olympic games.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 325

Whereas the people of Berlin will celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Jesse Owens' epochal winning of four gold medals at the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games on August 14 or 15, 1986;

Whereas the people of the United States have long maintained a unique and special relationship with the government and people of Berlin;

Whereas Jesse Owens represented himself, the United States, and the principles of freedom, equality, and human dignity so nobly and resolutely during the 1936 Olympic games;

Whereas Jesse Owens represented the United States internationally as the American "Ambassador of Sports", in a State Department tour of South Asia, as personal

representative of President Eisenhower to the 1956 Olympic games in Australia, and as director of the United States Olympic Committee; and

Whereas no other athlete better symbolizes the human struggle against tyranny, racism, and bigotry than Jesse Owens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) commends the government and people of Berlin for keeping alive the spirit of equality, freedom, and human dignity through their solemn commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of Jesse Owens' historic victories at the 1936 Berlin Olympic games;

(2) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the government and people of Berlin as they celebrate the legacy of Jesse Owens at the international athletics competition and memorial weekend in Berlin on August 14-15, 1986; and

(3) recalls and honors the significant work of Jesse Owens on behalf of the people and Government of the United States, and his victories in 1936 as a symbol of perseverance and the triumph of equality and justice over bigotry and racism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 325 and House Concurrent Resolution 326 which we will be considering shortly. These resolutions draw our attention to the political symbolism that the city of Berlin holds today. They recognize two noteworthy anniversaries in Berlin and come before us on the eve of Berlin's 750th anniversary as a city which occurs in 1987.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 325 has the support of the State Department. It was approved unanimously by the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, on May 21, 1986, and by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on June 5, 1986. I want to commend Congressman LANTOS, the chief sponsor of these resolutions, for his strong leadership on the issue.

House Concurrent Resolution 325 commends the government and people of Berlin for keeping alive the spirit set by the accomplishments of Jesse Owens at the 1936 summer Olympic games in Berlin. The story of Jesse Owens is well known. His victories 50 years ago were a courageous challenge to racist and hateful values practiced by Adolf Hitler's Nazi government. Jesse Owens' accomplishments symbolized the principles of freedom,

equality, and human dignity—principles which the city of Berlin has sought to protect since the end of the Second World War.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is of great importance to the people of Berlin, who look to the United States as a friend and as one of the defenders of their freedom. I urge my colleagues to vote for House Concurrent Resolution 325.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the chairman of our committee, for his support of these resolutions.

I would like to spend a minute or two asking, and then answering, the question: What is the merit of passing historical resolutions? We are often preoccupied with the problems of the day. Some might ask: What is the purpose of talking about the 1936 Olympics and Jesse Owens' spectacular victories at those Olympics?

Unless we root ourselves in historical context, we will be like a cork bobbing on a stormy sea. We will have no compass, no bearing, we will not know where we came from and we will not know where we are headed. I believe one of the very important tasks of the Congress is to remind itself and to remind the American people of important historical events.

The 1936 Olympics in Berlin and Jesse Owens' spectacular performance at those Olympics is one such event.

The 1936 Olympics was Hitler's Olympic games. There was a raging debate at the time as to whether in fact democratic countries should be represented at those Olympics. There were many who argued, in my view, quite persuasively, that the democratic societies of the globe should not have participated in those Olympics because, by doing so, they, in a sense, provided further legitimacy to the racist regime of Hitler.

The voices of those who said that politics and athletics should be separated prevailed. The Western democracies were still preoccupied by the aftermath of the Great Depression. They did not want to take on new problems. They took the course of least resistance, and they fielded teams at the 1936 Berlin Olympics.

Once that decision was made, the presence of the American Olympic team, and particularly the heroic achievements of Jesse Owens, became of paramount importance. The American Olympic team at the Berlin Olympics represented the triumph of democratic, free, and open societies.

I remember as a boy listening on the radio to those Olympics and the rhythmic chant of the American contingent, "U.S.A., U.S.A." It sounded like liberty. It was a voice for decency,

dignity, and freedom amidst Hitler's government.

Jesse Owens, a black American, demonstrated the phoniness of Hitler's theories of racial supremacy. In a moving, gripping series of performances, he succeeded in winning four Olympic gold medals.

It is interesting to contemplate how far we have come in the field of human rights in the last half a century. Could anyone contemplate holding the Olympics in South Africa today? Yet South Africa today, in terms of its racial orientation, is certainly no different from Hitler's Germany in 1936. We have come a long way, partly because of the efforts of heroic athletes like Jesse Owens, whom we commemorate in this resolution. Along with paying tribute to him, we pay tribute to the people of West Berlin who have maintained the memory and spirit that Jesse Owens represented in 1936 by honoring him in the forthcoming special commemorative athletic games in the city of Berlin in August 1986.

□ 1325

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution as a tribute to a great American athlete and to the free people of Berlin.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to compliment the gentleman from California for sponsoring this bill, and I want to join in strong support with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. LEE HAMILTON.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution before us which commends the government and people of Berlin for their commemoration of the anniversary of Jesse Owens' victories at the Olympic games.

Many of us remember the outstanding performance of Jesse Owens at the 1936 Olympic games in Germany. As a young black American, Jesse Owens beat Hitler's hand-picked "master race" athletes in their own backyard. His successes at those games are symbols of the human struggle against tyranny, racism, and bigotry that all of us must never forget.

Jesse Owens went on to serve his country as the "Ambassador of Sports" for many years and continued to bring credit upon himself and his country. America did not forget Jesse Owens or the people of Berlin. Since the end of the Second World War, the United States has maintained a special relationship with the government and people of that city.

It is appropriate that this resolution commends the Government and people of Berlin for commemorating the 50th anniversary of Jesse Owens' victories at the 1936 Berlin games.

The resolution also honors Jesse Owens for his victories and for his fine work on behalf of the people and Government of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this worthwhile resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 325, commending the government and people of Berlin for commemorating on August 14 and 15 the 50th anniversary of Jesse Owens' victories at the 1936 Berlin Olympics.

This legislation reminds us of an unhappy time for Berlin. The luster of the Olympics—the "Hitler Olympics" was tarnished by the triumph of "Aryan racism." The highlight of that event was the stunning victory of an American black, Jesse Owens, who triumphed, not only over his athletic adversaries, but whose victory also was symbolic of the triumph of equality and justice over the forces of hate and racism which were so virulent in those days.

It is therefore highly appropriate that we commend the people and the government of West Berlin for the special celebrations honoring this anniversary of Jesse Owens' efforts on behalf of our Nation and I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for focusing our attention on them. I urge my colleagues to fully support this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] that the House suspend the rule and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 325.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?



There was no objection.

**SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE BERLIN WALL IS AN INDICTMENT OF THE COMMUNIST SYSTEM**

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 326) expressing the sense of the Congress that the existence of the Berlin Wall after 25 years is a visible indictment of the Communist system and that the continued vitality of the Western sectors of the city is a testament to the Berliners' courage and devotion to freedom.

The Clerk read as follows:

**H. CON. RES. 326**

Whereas, on August 13, 1961, authorities in East Berlin erected the Berlin Wall, cruelly dividing the city and its people with barbed wire and concrete, following the exodus of more than two million Germans fleeing political oppression;

Whereas the Berlin Wall has failed to prevent the Western sectors of Berlin from regaining the position of a vibrant world city, firmly tied to the West;

Whereas the United States applauds and commends the courage and success of the Berliners in overcoming past adversity and geographic isolation;

Whereas people continue to risk and even to lose their lives scaling the Wall to freedom;

Whereas the United States remains committed to the principle of freedom for all men and women everywhere;

Whereas the United States remains committed to the strict observance and full implementation of the Quadripartite Agreement on Berlin;

Whereas the United States remains committed to the principles of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and

Whereas the United States remains committed to overcoming the artificial barriers dividing Berliners, Germans, and Europeans, and promoting the observance of human rights and self-determination: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—*

(1) expressly commends the courage and steadfastness of the Berliners in making the western part of the city a showcase of Western values and an internationally renowned metropolis;

(2) condemns the continued existence of the Berlin Wall and calls upon its builders to dismantle it; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to Berlin and its brave people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 326, the second resolution dealing with Berlin. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 326 has the support of the State Department. It was approved unanimously by the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, on May 21, 1986, and by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on June 5, 1986. I want again to commend Congressman LANTOS, the chief sponsor of this resolution, for his strong leadership on the issue.

House Concurrent Resolution 326, condemns the existence of the Berlin Wall, commends the residents of the western part of the city for making the city a model for Western values, and reaffirms the U.S. commitment to Berlin. August will mark the 25th anniversary of the construction of the Berlin Wall. It exists not because of fear of invasion but rather because of a fear that East Germans will leave for the freedom of the West. It also symbolizes the continued division of Europe and the imposition of a Soviet domination over the nations of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is of great importance to the people of Berlin, who look to the United States as a friend and as one of the defenders of their freedom. I urge my colleagues to vote for House Concurrent Resolution 326.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East for his support of this very important resolution.

West Berlin has occupied a unique role in the post-World War II history of our globe. It has been a democratic island in a totalitarian ocean. In a variety of ways, the Soviet Union and its satellites have attempted to squeeze Berlin and to squeeze the Berliners to force them to surrender to destroy the independent status of West Berlin.

First, in the late forties came the Berlin blockade. The Berlin blockade was a crude, primitive but potentially devastatingly effective device to suffocate that free city. Our response resulted in the Berlin airlift, at the height of which, every 45 seconds an airplane landed in West Berlin bringing food and fuel and other supplies to the beleaguered citizens of West Berlin and broke the blockade.

The Soviet leadership was not satisfied with allowing Berlin to live freely. East Berlin and East Germany were hemorrhaging. Large numbers of people, hundreds of thousands of

people, were voting with their feet. They were trying to get out from under a Communist, totalitarian system to make their way to the free world.

In July of 1961, over 30,000 people fled East Germany for West Berlin. In the first 10 days of August 1961, some 16,000 East Germans voted with their feet and made their way to freedom. A half-hour past midnight on the 13th of August, East German military police and army units deployed along the 25-mile zone between East and West Berlin began to build, Mr. Speaker, the first wall in human history designed not to keep the enemy out, but to keep their own people in.

It is often said that there is nothing new under the Sun. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Berlin Wall is very much something new under the Sun. It is the first wall in history, the only wall in history, designed to keep people from escaping their own homeland.

The walls and ramparts of medieval castles and fortresses, the Great Wall of China, were all defensive barriers against the enemy.

□ 1335

This wall is a wall against the people of East Germany.

When this January my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and I led a bipartisan congressional delegation to East and West Berlin, we met with the head of East Germany, Chairman Honecker. Our delegation called on him to dismantle the Berlin Wall. Twenty-five years is long enough. Economic developments in East Germany have progressed far enough so East Germany should now have the guts to dismantle the wall that keeps its people in, and finally join the community of civilized nations.

It is my earnest hope, Mr. Speaker, that next year, when the city of Berlin celebrates its 750th anniversary, East Berlin and West Berlin will no longer be divided by this wall of shame, and that the people of the two parts of that great city will be able to move freely, as civilized people ought to, in the closing years of the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution. It is critical that the American people and their representatives in Congress cry out loud and clear for the dismantling of a wall of shame that stands as a visible reminder of the bankruptcy of the Communist system and the outrageous division of the continent of Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and also my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VANDER JAGT], as cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution before us which states that the Berlin Wall is an indictment of the Communist system and that the vitality of the western sector of the city is a testament to the courage of the people of Berlin.

Who can forget the tragedy of the Berlin wall of shame? Twenty-five years ago, that offensive structure was built to divide the city and the people of Berlin. In spite of that barrier, the western part of Berlin has become an impressive world city closely linked to the West, in spite of its geographic isolation.

Even today, brave freedom-loving people continue to try to flee from East Berlin by scaling the Berlin wall of shame. Divisive artificial barriers as the wall are offensive to all people who believe in human rights and self-determination.

This resolution commends the courage of the people of West Berlin and reaffirms our commitment to that city and its people.

It also condemns the continued existence of the Berlin wall of shame and calls on its builders to dismantle it.

This resolution deserves our support. I call on my colleagues to join me in accepting this legislative initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. BEN GILMAN, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution marks the 25th anniversary of the erection of the Berlin Wall, a monstrosity that is an affront to all freedom-loving people.

When a House delegation led by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] was in Berlin last January, we personally witnessed the courage of the people of West Berlin, who are confronted with an extremely onerous situation made all the worse by the wall and the continued barbarity of this artificial division of their city.

The fact that the wall serves no purpose whatsoever except to keep the people behind it isolated from the Western World, demonstrated the fundamental weakness of the system by which East Germany is governed.

The anniversary of the wall's construction is a shameful reminder of yet another aspect of man's inhumanity to man. We all look forward, Mr. Speaker, to the day that the Berlin Wall will come tumbling down.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution. I have

no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 326.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 326, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4868, ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF 1986

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 4868.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

#### THE LESSON OF CUBA

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the 20th of May at the Omni Hotel in Miami, there was a great throng gathered together to commemorate Cuban National Independence Day and also the first anniversary of Radio Marti. The Vice President was the principal speaker on that occasion.

The gentleman who introduced the Vice President was the Honorable Jorge Mas, a great Cuban-American, indeed a great citizen of the world, a great national and world leader of the cause of freedom and in the fight against communism.

In his address introducing the Vice President, Mr. Mas told very movingly about the experience that he had had when he was a citizen of Cuba under the despotic tyranny of the present

man who heads up that beautiful island of the Caribbean, Castro. He told movingly of how it was too late on the part of too many to fight against Castro, because he was already established.

He warned that we might make the same mistake if we allow communism to take firm root in Nicaragua. He therefore urged that we remember that freedom is a precious product to be saved by those who are forward in their understanding of its jeopardy and its danger.

There was great applause for this moving address of Mr. Jorge Mas. I think it would be a subject of treasure for the Members of the House to read this moving address.

Therefore, I am including that address in the RECORD immediately following my remarks, as follows:

MAY 20, 1986.

Mr. Vice-President, Elected Officials, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Welcome to Miami Mr. Vice-President. Thanks for your visit. It will bring hope to the oppressed Cuban people who will listen to your speech through Radio Marti. Thanks to all of you for your continuing support.

Today, we are commemorating Cuba's National Independence Day and the first Anniversary of Radio Marti. I would like to begin by sharing with you a real story that occurred 26 years ago.

A few days after my arrival from Cuba, as a political refugee in July 1960, I went to North Carolina to visit some of my former college professors.

One night in a meeting at a friend's home, I told them about my reasons for leaving Cuba. I mentioned the loss of political freedom. In reply, they asked me about the Cuban Army and how it was performing its duty to defend the Constitution. I had to explain that Castro had taken over the Army and it couldn't help. When I described the confiscation of all private property by the Cuban Government, they asked me about the role of the police. I had to explain that the police had been dissolved. Economic freedom was gone, too.

One of my former professors suggested that labor leaders, students, and professionals should unite and do something. I had to explain that all free organizations had been banned and a totalitarian form of government was being established. By then, they could not believe what I was saying.

"Had you gone to the press to protest?" asked one of my friends. No, because all papers, radio and T.V. stations, I responded are under the control of the government. And they don't allow dissenters to protest.

I could sense that they did not want to believe what I was describing. But I went on to explain about my future plans.

I told them that I was going to join other fellow Cubans already in training camps who were getting ready to invade the Island and liberate Cuba. If we don't invade, I said the U.S. will suffer a devastating blow to its prestige and influence. Meanwhile, Castro's ambitions of ruling the world will be unleashed.

It was just too much for my American friends. They did not want to be disturbed with bad news. My former English professor looked at my eyes and said: "Jorge, you are



so emotionally involved in your problems that you lack the objectivity to make a fair presentation. You are either exaggerating or you are obsessed with your fears about communism.

Twenty six years later, history has proved that I was, unfortunately, right. But the worst thing is that ignorance of the threats to our freedom I confronted in North Carolina is still widespread in America and even here in Miami.

Such ignorance generates a contrast of perceptions. It is the contrast between those who have never lost their freedom and live with the serenity and security that a free society provides and those, like most of us, who live with intensity and motivation driven into their hearts because they have suffered fear, grief and persecution.

We see history repeating itself in Nicaragua. However, we also see people reluctant to confront reality and people who are afraid to stand up to today's challenge.

Lack of knowledge is one thing. But dismissing what is already known is another thing altogether. We cannot ignore what happened in the Soviet Union 70 years ago, in Cuba in 1959, and what is happening in Nicaragua right now. We must acknowledge the truth and learn from the lessons of history. And ladies and gentlemen, this is a national tragedy. No wonder that when Anatoly Scharansky was asked last week in New York which was his biggest disappointment since he left the Soviet Union, he said the "non-understanding of the Soviet Union by the West. The West ignores the real nature of the Soviet system."

That is why we value so much this, and every opportunity to meet in this free land, to speak our free mind to the free world.

Yes, we Cuban-Americans have prospered in the United States. Yes, we have made a contribution to Florida because of hard work, dedication, and talent. But I prefer to talk about other contributions that we make everyday to the U.S. and to the free world through the efforts of the Cuban-American National Foundation.

I prefer to talk about the publications we share with our American brothers and sisters detailing our experiences and our concerns for the future. I prefer to talk about our investments, not in local banks or in local business ventures, but in the political arena to preserve freedom in the U.S. and to protect the national security of this great nation.

I prefer to talk about what we are doing on Capitol Hill to educate our Senators and Congressmen in order to avoid another Bay of Pigs in Nicaragua.

And I prefer to talk about the Foundation's efforts to bring together all the ethnic groups of the Americas, including Anglos in the U.S., Indians of Central America, and blacks of the Caribbean islands. We do this because we learned from Jose Marti that "at the time of hope and peril, all the peoples of the Americas become one."

And during these times of peril, we must stand together or we will perish together. We have no choice. Either we stop Communism in Central America or we will be fighting a war at the Mexican border. Therefore, Cuba and Nicaragua must be freed or there will be no peace in this Hemisphere.

Welcome to Miami, Mr. Vice-President. Welcome to the city that has become a crossroad through which men and women seeking freedom and peace come to tell others about the value of democracy and liberty.

We thank you Mr. Vice-President for your courage and compassion. We thank you for

spending time with the people of Cuba and Nicaragua. We thank you for sharing with us the frustrations and ideals of people whose lives have been crushed and have had to start all over again.

We thank you for helping our President liberate Granada and for providing help to freedom fighters all over the world.

We thank you Mr. Vice President because when everybody thought that Radio Marti would never become a reality, you stood tall and firm, and gave us a hand. And then, Radio Marti went on the air just a year ago today.

You are, Mr. Vice-President, a leader with vision. It is a great privilege, ladies and gentleman, to introduce to you the Vice-President of the United States, the Honorable George Bush.

### BALTIC STATES FREEDOM DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, June 14 marks yet another anniversary of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. Forty-six years have passed since the proud people of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia were overrun by the Communists, who inhumanely exiled, deported, tortured, and murdered thousands.

The Soviet Union in 1940 was committed to the systematic destruction of these three Baltic nations, along with eliminating the language, literature, culture, religion, and heritage of their peoples. In order to insure the success of their intentions, the Soviets first ordered the executions of the intellectuals and those who were politically active. Efforts were then concentrated on the massive deportation of the peasants and others whose only desire was to be left alone and live in peace.

Within a year, the Communists intensified their efforts to break the will of the people who resisted their oppressive rule. Men, women, and little children of entire villages were rounded up and herded together under miserably overcrowded and unsanitary conditions, and were shipped in railroad boxcars east to the Soviet Union. Although these genocidal deportations briefly stopped when Germany invaded the Baltic States in June 1941, when the Red Army regained control in 1944, this activity began again.

During the last 46 years of occupation, the Soviets have continued to deport millions of Estonians, Lithuanians, and Latvians, from their native land to remote parts of the Soviet Union, and at the same time have introduced large numbers of Russians into the Baltic States in an attempt to russify them further. Despite this action, the Communists have been unable to completely crush the spirit of the Baltic people, and their desire to determine the course of their own destiny and live in Freedom.

The United States had never recognized the illegal annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union, and I was privileged to add my name as a cosponsor to House Joint Resolution 500, a bill to designate June 14, 1986, as "Baltic Freedom Day." Similar legislation was approved with my strong support by the full House of Representatives on March 15, and

signed into public law by President Reagan on May 28. The text of House Joint Resolution 500 follows:

H.J. RES. 500

Joint resolution designating June 14, 1986, as "Baltic Freedom Day"

Whereas the people of the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have cherished the principles of religious and political freedom and independence;

Whereas the Baltic Republics have existed as independent, sovereign nations belonging to and fully recognized by the League of Nations; and

Whereas the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) in collusion with Nazi Germany signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact which allowed the U.S.S.R. in 1940 to illegally seize and occupy the Baltic States and by force incorporated them against their national will and contrary to their desire for independence and sovereignty into the U.S.S.R.;

Whereas due to Soviet and Nazi tyranny, by the end of World War II, the Baltic nations had lost 20 per centum of their total population;

Whereas the people of the Baltic Republics have individual and separate cultures, national traditions and languages distinctively foreign to those of Russia;

Whereas the U.S.S.R. since 1940 has systematically implemented its Baltic genocide by deporting native Baltic peoples from their homelands to forced labor and concentration camps in Siberia and elsewhere, and by relocating masses of Russians to the Baltic Republics, thus threatening the Baltic cultures with extinction through russification;

Whereas the U.S.S.R. has imposed upon the captive people of the Baltic Republics an oppressive political system which has destroyed every vestige of democracy, civil liberties, and religious freedom;

Whereas the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia find themselves today subjugated by the U.S.S.R., locked into a union they deplore, denied basic human rights, and persecuted for daring to protest;

Whereas the U.S.S.R. refuses to abide by the Helsinki accords which the U.S.S.R. voluntarily signed;

Whereas the United States as a member of the United Nations has repeatedly voted with a majority of that international body to uphold the right of other countries of the world to determine their fates and be free of foreign domination;

Whereas the U.S.S.R. has steadfastly refused to return to the people of the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia the right to exist as independent republics separate and apart from the U.S.S.R. or permit a return of personal, political, and religious freedom;

Whereas 1986 marks the forty-sixth anniversary of the United States continued policy of nonrecognition of the illegal forcible occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U.S.S.R.; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) the Congress recognizes the continuing desire and the right of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia for freedom and independence from the domination of the U.S.S.R.;

(2) the Congress deplores the refusal of the U.S.S.R. to recognize the sovereignty of the Baltic Republics and to yield to their

rightful demands for independence from foreign domination and oppression;

(3) the Congress reaffirms the indictment against the U.S.S.R. of the Copenhagen Manifesto signed by the Baltic Tribunal on July 26, 1985 by Doctor Theodor Veiter, Reverend Michael Bourdeaux, Sir James Fawcett, Per Ahlmark, and Jean Marie Daillet;

(4) the fourteenth day of June 1986, the anniversary of the mass deportation of Baltic peoples from their homelands in 1941, be designated "Baltic Freedom Day" as a symbol of the solidarity of the American people with the aspirations of the enslaved Baltic people; and

(5) the President of the United States be authorized and requested to issue a proclamation for the observance of Baltic Freedom Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities and to submit the issue of the Baltic Republics to the United Nations so that the issue of Baltic self-determination will be brought to the attention of the United Nations General Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with Americans of Estonian, Lithuanian, and Latvian descent in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and all over this Nation, in commemorating the 46th anniversary of Baltic States Freedom Day. The sad fate and memory of the victims of Communist persecution shall never be forgotten, as we hope and pray that democracy will ultimately triumph over this tyranny, and the sovereignty of these three nations will one day be restored.

#### SOLUTIONS FOR OUR FARM PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for some time in today's session to discuss, along with my friend from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], the farm situation in this country and the agricultural program which currently exists, and what we might do about it.

I come from one of the most rural areas of America. I represent the entire State of North Dakota. I was looking at some unemployment information the other day, and I realized, as I have for some time now, that the deterioration of the farm economy is affecting not just farmers but everyone who lives in rural parts of this country from North Dakota all the way down to Texas.

New York City currently has an unemployment rate of 7.9 percent; Bismarck, ND, has an unemployment rate of 8.8 percent. Pittsburgh has an unemployment rate of 8.1 percent; in Dickinson, ND, it is 11.9 percent. Baltimore has unemployment at 6.9 percent; Williston, ND, at 13.2 percent.

Why is there such great unemployment in States like North Dakota? Well, in North Dakota we are losing 32 family farmers a week at this point. These are not just statistics. Behind the number 32 is a farm family with

the name of Olson or Larson or Johnson, and so forth, with a farm they have lived on and worked for a couple of decades, and who discover now that with farm prices falling, and falling rather rapidly over a long period of time, they can no longer pay their bills.

□ 1345

Not too many years ago, in 1980, to be exact, we were spending somewhere around \$3 to \$4 billion on the farm program in this country. Well, this year it is estimated to be \$26 billion. Now, think of the difference, going from \$3½ billion expenditures on the farm program to \$26 billion, and things have gotten worse.

In other words, the taxpayer is paying much, much more to support a farm plan, and that farm plan has left family farmers in a condition that is much, much worse.

How can that happen, you might ask? Well, it is because the farm program in this country is rooted with the philosophy that you are going to follow production and therefore those who produce the most get the most from this farm program.

The current farm program is fundamentally wrong. I believe it takes the wrong approach. The right policy, in my judgment, is to develop a farm program that says we want to maintain a network of family farms in America. If we did so as a matter of policy, we would spend our money in a much different manner than it is now spent under the present farm plan.

Now, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] is with me today and what we want to do during this special order is discuss between the two of us what we have been talking about with other Members of Congress concerning the course which should be taken to solve this farm crisis that exists in this country.

We have parity prices that are lower than what they were in the Great Depression. We have family farmers every single day across the farm belt having to sell and leave the farm, not because they want to, but because our condition in the farm belt of this country does not give family farmers a decent chance to make a living. We have our small communities in the Midwest suffering great unemployment. Main street businesses are closing their doors. The taxpayer, on the other hand, is paying enormous amounts of money for the farm program and yet it is not working.

So what shall we do about it? That is exactly what we want to discuss today.

I would like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Kansas, who does such excellent work on agricultural problems.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I appreciate my colleague from North Dakota yielding.

I think what we have to do first is examine this problem that we have. This is not just a farm problem, but an enormous problem affecting our rural America. We should look at what solutions have been offered, and then examine the current solution, the administration's solution. Their solution, as the gentleman has so aptly stated, is to let the marketplace prevail. In order to do that there has been a tendency to allow a precipitous drop in farm prices, particularly grain prices, in order to let the world marketplace decide who shall survive and who shall die. That is what we have seen, particularly in the grain country, wheat, corn, soybeans, we have seen a dramatic reduction in the prices of those commodities as the support levels have been dropped rather precipitously. That has also affected livestock prices as well, particularly cattle prices.

Now, to make up for this difference, the administration says, "Let's lower the price of farm commodities." So we have done that rather precipitously.

They said, "Well, let's keep the deficiency payments or basically the subsidy payments up for awhile." So even though those payments have been under some pressure from Gramm-Rudman and other budget related pictures, what we have had here is the base farm prices started to fall rather dramatically, but the subsidy prices stayed up about this level.

So curiously and ironically, farmers have both very low prices as a result of the deliberate attempt on the part of this administration to lower those prices, but very, very high deficiency payments, very high budget exposure and very high Government cash payments.

So perhaps with the most conservative administration in decades, we see a farm policy that is based upon huge Government payments to farmers.

Where do those payments go? They go largely to the largest farmers. So we see a lot of the mid-sized farmer who are in the most trouble facing very low prices, not really getting a lot of payments, and we see the very largest farmers who are getting the most payments under this formula. So you have the worst of all worlds. You have very low prices, deliberately set by the administration. You have huge budget exposure because of massive Government payments going to the people who may not need them as much as others who are hurting; so you have basic, fundamental policy problem here. This is a policy which truly has its head screwed on backward and on which we ought to try to do something about.

I think that is the function of the special order, to talk about what constructive options we may come up with.



Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I think it is safe to say both of us agree it is not a Democratic or a Republican problem. We have had miserable and good farm programs under both Republicans and Democrats in the past.

But I think it is important to explore what has happened so far in the 1980's. It is now 1986. I know the gentleman has sat on the committee with me when Secretary Block came in his maiden voyage to the Agriculture Committee in the House and began to steer a course that he believed represented his vision of where we ought to be moving in agricultural policy.

Here was his vision, and it was fatally flawed and that is why we are where we are today. His vision was that we would develop a program which received its signals from the marketplace. We would give producers in this country maximum flexibility to produce what they wanted, and allow the administration to simply market it overseas.

Well, it took about 12 months to sober him up, because clearly that was not working and then he moved from that idea to an acreage set-aside program. Then he regressed from that to a set-aside program with incentives. Then he went from a set aside with incentives to a PIK program, and then to a paid diversion program. He just zigzagged his way through his term as Secretary of Agriculture with the premise that what this country produced it could sell.

Back in those days, we were selling approximately \$40 billion of agricultural commodities overseas. This year it is going to be something under \$30 billion in export sales. So not only are we not selling more, we are selling dramatically less, which describes the fundamental failure of the underpinnings of this current policy. That is why I am sure the gentleman from Kansas and some others from our part of the country believe, we have to re-evaluate where we are and what we do to shift gears philosophically and demonstrate how we solve the problem for family farmers.

My feeling is that no matter what we do, it must have at its roots a pursuit of policies that maintain a network of family farms in this country. If that is not our goal, then we are going to fail. Our goal must be to do what is necessary to maintain a network of family farms. If you pursue that goal, you develop a substantially different farm program than we now have.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think what he is talking about is the theory behind this administration's export oriented farm policy. It would get prices so low that we would drive the competition out of business, the Argentines, the Canadians, the Australians, the Europeans, would just

fold up shop and go home. The only problem is that a large number of our own are folding up shop and going home in the meantime.

The administration would argue, "Aha, but in the long term people will be a lot better off."

I think it was H.L. Mencken who described the difference between the short term and the long term. He once said that the difference between the short term and the long term was that in the long term we are all dead, and that is certainly true in agriculture. If we are going to go for this very long term of an export-oriented policy, which is to drive prices down to out compete with the competition, we are going to kill off our competitors and us at the same time.

In the meantime, it will cost us dramatic amounts of dollars in the process, and the policy just is not producing any result.

All of this money which is going theoretically into agriculture is not helping our rural communities, small towns, rural banks, rural infrastructure, and rural schools. It is a very serious problem for America. It just cries out for a responsible legislative solution that we can try to reach some consensus on.

As the gentleman also points out, this is not just a partisan problem. I would have to say that it has been this administration pushing this market-oriented low price farm policy for a long time; but all of us have had great difficulty finding a responsible answer, particularly having to deal with an administration that has been so ideological about it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Well, it is true that this administration's farm plan is a mirror of Herbert Hoover's approach to farming because Herbert Hoover and this administration both in essence say, "Let's get Government out of the business of farming."

Now, that sounds excellent. I mean, everybody would say, "Yes, let's have less Government if we can have less Government."

If what that means is we want to drive prices down to world levels, then that is just a subterfuge for saying, "Let's not care about who farms America. Let's not worry about whether we have 2 million or 2,000 farmers. Let's just worry about seeing how much we can capture when we get those prices down to an international export load."

Well, my feeling is that this approach ignores part of the question which we should be addressing in rural America. One of the things that we ought to be asking ourselves, as Japan and some Western European countries have, is it our policy to care about whether we have family farms or not? If not, you are probably persuaded to move in the direction of the President's farm program, because we will

certainly end up with very few farmers under that kind of a farm program. We will end up with some giant agri-factories that start tractors in the West and farm them all the way to the East and harvest the same way. But that is not my vision of what rural America's future ought to be.

My vision of rural America's future is a country with a policy on price structures which says that we want to be able to maintain a network of family farms for lots of very important reasons. Let me just mention a couple.

If the consumers think they are paying too much now, wait until they face the dilemma if we have a couple thousand corporations farming America. Then the corporations will set prices. Then we will find out what kind of prices the consumers are faced with.

A network of family farms is very important, in my judgment, for many reasons. It is important for consumers, for security, for lifestyle in rural America, for the old Thomas Jefferson notion that if you maintain a network of broad ownership patterns in this country, you also maintain a network of support necessary to guarantee our basic freedoms in this country. For all those reasons, I think it is very important for us to do what Japan and some others have done, to maintain a network of family farms.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just echo what the gentleman is saying and make the point that if we are serious about the kind of program we have been following in the last 4 or 5 years, it will inevitably mean fewer and fewer people living in the vast rural sections of this country. This means that the millions of folks who live in States like North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri and the 30 or 40 other States with predominantly rural populations will see those populations just dry up, atrophy, diminish. The people will move to the urban areas of this country where that probably will precipitate into more and more types of urban problems which we have avoided by keeping a good solid rural population.

You can already see that happening in small towns around America. That is one reason for wanting to preserve a family farm style of agriculture, is to preserve basically a rural style of life which is important for America's security and also for America's values.

To reiterate what the gentleman is saying, we will always produce food in America. God blessed us with land that is incredibly fertile. The issue is who will produce that food? The way we are going right now, we will have an infinitesimal amount of people, a fraction of what we had 15, 20, and 30 years ago, doing the farming.

It has profound implications on the cost of food, on the availability of food, and perhaps even on our national security in terms of decentralization of the food production capabilities of America.

So the challenge for us is to figure out what can we do with the dollars that we have and/or the public policy choices that we make, as the gentleman says, to maintain those people in that part of the country.

□ 1400

So we just do not have the center part of America or the Southeast part of America drying up and nobody living there any more. We will have a bunch of tenant farmers with thousands of tractors run by a central clearinghouse in New York City or Chicago or Los Angeles or Dallas, and so forth.

That is our challenge. The challenge is a serious challenge. It is also a challenge to do more than just complain about the administration's policies. We have had great difficulty in coming up with alternatives, and I think that is what we are trying to do here today.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me say that I think the threat here in the short term is that the administration's approach is to drive down prices, which they admit, and prices are going to keep moving down in order to reach some level at which they think they can slide all this grain out in some world market.

What this does, as the gentleman explained on the floor today and on several other occasions as well, is magnify the difference between the world price and deficiency payments or loan rates, and that creates the artificially high expenditure here at the Federal Government level for the farm program. Incidentally, the administration estimated this year's Federal Farm Program cost would be \$9½ billion. That is what they originally estimated, \$9½ billion. In fact, they just missed it. It is going to be \$26½ billion.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Does the gentleman mean the cost of this farm program to the Government is going to be equal or greater than the amount of agricultural exports overseas?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Probably, very close to that.

In addition, Gramm-Rudman is going to take effect, unless this Congress agrees on a budget to avert that and there is no guarantee it will happen. Gramm-Rudman will make an artificial cut; that is, a cut without determining what is useful and what is useless, and we are going to see a substantial cut in these current support prices which will lead to chaos out there in the farm community.

That is what I see in the near future. The current setup is a bad program, and as bad as it is, it will get cut

by 20 or 30 percent at some point under Gramm-Rudman.

So our job at this point is to find out what we can do that would cost the taxpayer less money and at the same time give family farmers in this country a chance to make a living. Can that be done? The answer is "Yes." Without any question, the answer is "Yes." This Congress can save the American taxpayers money and largely solve the farm problem domestically if we develop the right kind of farm plan that focuses on the needs of family farmers and pursues the policy that this country wants to maintain a network of family farmers.

This is the type of effort that the gentleman from Kansas and I and some others have been meeting on for weeks. The latest series of meeting is simply an ongoing part of meetings that we have been having for the last several years.

We have got to develop policies that move us from a position of having a farm program that costs too much and does not work to having a farm program that costs less and works much, much better, and gives family farmers a shot at making a living out in farm country.

That assurance does not exist today, but it could, spending less money than we now spend.

We have talked about this during the reauthorization of the 1985 farm bill, and the gentleman made a very interesting point. This farm bill is particularly sensitive to budget cuts because it is basically a dollars-going-out-to-farmers farm bill. Therefore, if we are forced to cut the budget, those dollars going out to farmers will be cut rather dramatically. As a matter of fact, in terms of cutting the budget, if we cut across the board, farmers will probably suffer more than anybody else because we have designed a farm bill that is basically huge Government payments going to farmers to make up the difference of low grain prices.

So it may be just in a curious, ironic way, that these budget cuts we are going through will cause us to sit back and say we want to save the family farmer. The present farm program is being particularly and acutely hit by these budget cuts, so we have to find a policy alternative to keep family farmers in business, and we have talked about a couple. One has to do with the targeting of farm benefits to those who desperately need the help, or a certain size of farmer. Maybe we target the first x thousands bushels of production or units of production. Another possibility would be a more mandatory program that is based upon significant cutbacks in production coupled with higher loan rates, not lower loan rates.

None of these policy choices are easy, but both of those policy choices, as different as they are from each

other, will save this Government significant amounts of money and also tend to get aid to those who need it the greatest.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I sometimes describe the current farm program as a cake-and-crumbs program; the largest producers get the cake and the rest of them get the crumbs. Gramm-Rudman, if it intersects the farm program, not only slices the cake but it also slices the crumbs. When we start slicing something which is not worthwhile in the first place, we end up with chaos and catastrophe for family farm units.

But let us talk about targeting just for a few minutes. The gentleman from Kansas is correct. We could take the money we now spend and, in fact, spend less, and target it in a way that improves the network of family farms in this country. May I suggest rather than try to control supply in some definite way and, therefore, support prices throughout the line of supply and ultimately benefiting those who produce or supply the most with the largest support prices, we instead support the price of wheat to the tune of 15,000 bushels of wheat you raise because that is all the Government can afford. We do this by layering in a decent support price of \$5 a bushel, and say, "We are going to give you a good support price on the first 15,000 bushels, but if you want to produce over that, you are welcome to do so in a free market system but you are going to have to sell at the world price. We, frankly, do not have enough money to support you over the first 15,000 bushels; we do have enough money to give a good, strong price support for the first increment of production of a family farm."

That is one approach. Some would say that is radical. I say that is true; it is substantially different. As somebody once said, that which is right has always been called radical by those who have a vested interest in that which is wrong. A lot of folks have a vested interest in the wrong way to develop farm policy and they exert pressure on this House as the gentleman from Kansas knows.

Developing an approach that provides a strong support price for the first increment of production is one way to target stronger price support benefits to family farmers. There are other ways, as the gentleman from Kansas just suggested. Farmers themselves could develop, in a democratic way, a desire to control supply and decide, as they already do with some commodities, they are only going to produce so much and can only make it if they have a marketing certificate. There a number of ways of achieving it.

We had a debate on this floor during the deliberation on the last farm bill.



We were approximately 28 votes short of turning the corner on farm policy, to target and to provide a higher marketing loan. We came very close in this House of Representatives during the debate on the last farm bill in turning the corner philosophically.

I believe it is my responsibility at this point not to sit by and watch 32 farmers a week go broke in my great State of North Dakota, or watch dozens of farmers a week go broke in the gentleman's State. It is our responsibility to say we are spending too much money and getting virtually nothing for it. How do we fix it? What more can we do to convince other Members of Congress, most of whom to not come from agricultural districts, that there is a better way?

Mr. GLICKMAN. We have a couple of very serious public policy choices, and one is to stay the course. We have heard that term before, stay the status quo. In our parts of the country, and in rural parts of the country generally, not just in Kansas and North Dakota, but in California and Georgia and South Carolina and Illinois and Iowa, that staying the course is not acceptable.

The other public policy choice is to do something different, do something not just unique for the sake of being unique, but to try to provide the help to those who really need it.

The gentleman from North Dakota has been the leader in developing the concept of targeting, getting the aid to those who need it. Folks at home are so surprised, particularly in the urban parts of this country, when we tell them every farmer can receive Federal support, regardless of whether they need it or not. They say, "Well, that is not the way we thought the farm programs were supposed to operate. There is so little money for everything else, why can every farmer get support even if they do not necessarily need it?"

So the concept of targeting is based upon the theory that we provide assistance for those who basically need help. I submit to the gentleman, because of his leadership in this area, when we finally acquire constructive solutions to this year's farm bill, it should be based upon that concept, targeting farm benefits to those who need it. This should be done largely because we have a limited amount of resources and funds and, therefore, we should give it out to those who cannot survive without it.

□ 1410

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I always hesitate to use individual names on the floor of the House, and I do not mean to use them unfairly, but let me give you an example. Tenneco Corp. is a big corporation, but is also a farmer.

Now, most of the farmers that the gentleman and I know in our districts are real farmers; that is, they are people with family names who live on the family farms. Tenneco Corp., Prudential and some others get a significant slice of the farm program benefits because they are farmers as well. But it is hard for me to become convinced that the large corporate farms need to collect such an enormous amount of the money we are spending in the pursuit of an agricultural policy.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture was established under Abraham Lincoln. In the early 1900's, and during FDR's period, we began with some moderate price supports in what had been conceived originally as a little bridge across price-depression valleys, where the international price was unpredictable.

It was felt that family farmers had too thin a financial structure to survive, so they created a little bridge across those valleys. That bridge in modern times has become a set of golden arches for the biggest producers in the world. The big producers are collecting the major amounts of capital from the farm bill, and wrongly so.

Those of us who are trying to change this faltering policy are, I suspect, viewed as radical by those who have a vested interest in keeping what is. I tell you, if we do not change this type of policy in the next couple of years, and probably you and I would submit, if we do not do it in the next 6, 8, or 10 months, we are going to see a ravaged rural America. We will not be able to shape policies years down the road which will recapture or recover what we know now as a lifestyle very important to this country.

The paradox is that the family farmers are really America's economic allstars. I mean, their production has exceeded anything civilization has ever known. They are enormously successful, and yet they are going broke in record numbers. That must mean one of a couple of things: The most likely of which is our agricultural policy in this country is fundamentally wrong, and it is an area we are going to have to try and fix.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with the gentleman. Let us hope that we have the openmindedness as Members of a great diverse body to deal with these issues intelligently without being locked into traditional vested interests which may be comfortable, but may not be right for the times.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I might also say in conclusion that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] and I and others have been holding meetings. In fact, we are holding another one at 8 a.m. tomorrow with other like-minded Members to discuss an alternative farm policy which turns

the corner and gives the family farmer something to hope for.

I feel certain we are not going to be able to come up with a new farm program for this crop year. But I am hoping we can exert enough influence and spend enough time to put together a sound proposal which could have an opportunity to be considered by Congress in time for next year's crop year.

If we do not do it, nobody is going to do it. I fear if we leave it up to the administration, their attitude would be not to care how many farmers exist out there. Somebody is going to be pulling the plow; somebody is going to drive the combine; somebody is going to move wheat to the elevator, and they do not care who that somebody is.

I think who that somebody is is the entire issue. The issue is: Are we or are we not going to have family farmers in this country. If we are going to have family farmers, we had better get about the business of developing policy which spends less of the taxpayers' money, but does a whole lot more for family farmers than the current system.

The nice part of this problem, if there is anything nice about a problem like this, is it has a solution which spends less money, but does work for family farmers.

I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] for participating in this special order.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, June 17.

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, June 18.

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, June 19.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 60 minutes, on June 18.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. CHAPPIE.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

Mr. KEMP.

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. SILJANDER in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. BONER of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. MACKEY.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. WOLPE in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. GARCIA in two instances.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

#### SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2069. An act to amend the Job Training Partnership Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to commemorate the bicentennial anniversary of the first patent and the first copyright laws; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 9, 1986, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 357. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 15, 1986, through September 21, 1986, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 361. Joint resolution opposing the participation of the Chilean vessel *Esmeralda* in the July 4th Liberty Weekend celebration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported

that that committee did on June 13, 1986 present to the President, for his approval, a Joint Resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to designate October 8, 1986, as "National Fire Fighters Day."

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1986, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3717. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting notification of two deferrals of budget authority that have not been reported by the President, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 686(a) (H. Doc. No. 99-234) to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3718. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Shipbuilding and Logistics), transmitting notification of the proposed decision to convert to contractor performance the dry cleaning services functions at the Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, VA, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 nt.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3719. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 6-170, "Prohibition of Discrimination in the Provision of Insurance Act of 1986", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3720. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 6-171, "Street and Alley Closing and Acquisition Procedures Act of 1982 Relocation Assistance Amendment Act of 1986", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3721. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 6-172, "Closing of a Segment of Neal Street, N.E., S.O. 84-410, Adjacent to Squares 4491 and 4492 Act of 1986", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3722. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 6-173, "Homestead Housing Preservation Act of 1986", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3723. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 6-174, "Victims of Violent Crimes Compensation Act of 1981 Amendments Act of 1986", and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3724. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services; transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enhance the ability of States to improve the administra-

tion and delivery of preventive and remedial family crisis assistance and protective services, including prevention and treatment of abuse and neglect of children, spouses, and the elderly, to eliminate unnecessary restrictions on federally assisted programs for those purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3725. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed letter(s) of offer to Kuwait for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$70 million (Transmittal No. 86-37), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3726. A letter from the Secretary General, U.S. Olympic Committee, transmitting a copy of the committee's financial statement and a report on its activities, pursuant to the act of September 21, 1950, chapter 975, section 113(a) (92 Stat. 3049); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3727. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of an amended construction prospectus for Charleston, SC, pursuant to Public Law 86-249, section 7(a) (86 Stat. 217); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3728. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Financial Audit—Examination of GSA's Fiscal Year 1985 Financial Statement" (GAO/AFMD-86-55), pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Armed Services, and Public Works and Transportation.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order the House on June 12, 1986, the following report was filed on June 13, 1986]

Mr. WOLPE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 4868. A bill to prohibit loans to, other investments in, and certain other activities with respect to, South Africa, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 99-638, Part 1). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted June 16, 1986]

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4868. A bill to prohibit loans to, other investments in, and certain other activities with respect to, South Africa, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 99-638, Part 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subdivision among programs of budget allocation for fiscal year 1986 (Rept. 99-639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4463. A bill to establish programs to promote effective schools and to encourage joint parent-child educational approaches, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 99-640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4841. A bill to amend



the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act with respect to State allotments under the Act. (Rept. 99-641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of June 12, 1986]

The Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4348; H.R. 4348 referred to the Union Calendar, and ordered printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X, and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARR:

H.R. 5033. A bill to require that the U.S. Postal Service assign a single ZIP code with respect to points of delivery within Waterford, MI, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 5034. A bill to provide for temporary duty-free treatment for cyclosporine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. CONTE):

H.R. 5035. A bill establishing a commission to coordinate the commemoration of the bicentennial of the Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 356. Concurrent resolution to condemn the Government of South Africa for invoking the state of emergency in certain magisterial districts in response to the anniversary of the 1976 Soweto uprising, and to demand an end to the state of emergency in South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 357. Concurrent resolution calling upon the U.S. Government to recognize the Afghan resistance as the legitimate representative of the Afghan people and

terminate diplomatic relations with the Soviet-installed element; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H. Res. 477. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to authorize the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to provide for payment of reasonable attorney's fees of any Member, officer, or employee of the House against whom a complaint is made; to the Committee on Rules.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 704: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ARMEY, and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 997: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1213: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 1626: Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 2255: Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 2535: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2952: Mr. WEAVER and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 3429: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 3766: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4057: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HAYES, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FISH, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 4060: Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SABO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. COBEY.

H.R. 4194: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 4233: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 4260: Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LUKE, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. LONG, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HILER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. GALLO, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. RAY, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 4388: Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 4593: Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 4660: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. FUQUA, and Mr. BENNETT.

H.R. 4828: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4864: Mr. MRAZEK and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 4871: Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. FROST, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 381: Mr. WYLIE, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 508: Mr. HUGHES.

H.J. Res. 593: Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.J. Res. 642: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DYMAALLY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARTIN of New York.

H.J. Res. 649: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MONSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BYRANT, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. SPENCE.

H. Con. Res. 325: Mr. WYLIE.

H. Res. 413: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H. Res. 468: Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. MITCHELL.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

388. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, Euclid, OH, relative to recognition of Save American Industry/Jobs Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

389. Also, petition of the International Good Neighbor Council, Monterrey, Mexico, relative to the establishment of a 200-mile free-trade zone; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Ways and Means.